



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The Lord's Supper

A Clerical Symposium

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CONTRIBUTORS.

C. E. LUTHARDT, D.D.

E. DE PRESSENSE, D.D.

RICHARD F. LITTLEDALE, D.C.I.

JOHN PAGE HOPPS.

DAVID BROWN, D.D.

W. SMITH, D.D.

W. CROSBY BARLOW, M.A.

M. F. SADLER, M.A.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

THOMAS LEACH.

P. J. GLOAG, D.D.

G. W. OLVER, B.A.

THE LORD'S SUPPER,

*ITS DESIGN, AND THE BENEFIT IT
CONFERS TO THE INDIVIDUAL
AND THE CHURCH.*

A Clerical Symposium.



London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

—
MDCCLXXXI.

138. f. 224.

[The following Papers are reprinted from the HOMILETICAL
QUARTERLY *for 1881.]*

Hasell, Watson, and Viney, Printers, London and Aylesbury.

A CLERICAL SYMPOSIUM.

I.

THE Lord's institution of His Supper was in connection with the Passover which He kept with His disciples, before concluding it with the Hallel. By this means He intimated that He would have His Supper regarded as the New Testament Passover. What, then, was the Passover? 1. The Passover was a feast, not a sacrifice. The sacrifice was presupposed in the feast. Therefore the Lord's Supper, also, is not (as the Romish dogma teaches) a sacrifice, but a feast. The sacrifice is presupposed in the feast. *He* offered the sacrifice; *we* keep the feast. 2. The Passover was the feast of a sacrifice. Therefore the Lord's Supper, also, is the feast of a sacrifice. He is the sacrifice; He sacrificed His body and blood. This sacrifice we receive and enjoy in the Lord's Supper. 3. The Passover was not a mere commemoration of a past fact belonging to history; but in it Israel celebrated its present saving fellowship with Jehovah—the fellowship founded upon that fact—and looked forward to its future consummation. So also in the Lord's Supper we celebrate not merely the memory of a past fact, but that salvation of the present, in the fellowship of which we stand and which looks forward to its future consummation. These are the views we gather from the passage which recounts the institution of the Lord's Supper.

What are the views we gather from the institution itself? The Lord took bread and "brake it." He broke it for the purpose of distributing it, as He was always accustomed to do, acting as the head of the household who presided at the feast. The breaking, then, was in order to distribution. It is not a symbol of His death; for His body was not broken (John xix. 36). He breaks the bread in order to distribute it; it is His to give, *we* are to receive.

"Take, eat." What He gives is to be partaken of, not worshipped, not adored. *He* is the giver; He is present and acts. We are at His table still. He is the head of the household; we are the guests fed by Him.

He took bread and wine. He takes earthly elements—as water in baptism, so bread and wine in the sacrament of the altar; for He would impart His gifts through earthly instruments. We are not pure spirits, but live in the body. To men living in the body all spiritual effects are mediated by sensible means. So Divine grace has chosen earthly means by which to communicate itself to us. Bread and wine—the former nourishes and strengthens, the latter gives cheerfulness of heart: He would give us strength and gladness. Bread and wine are the most universal, as they are the noblest, products of earth. The former stands at the beginning of the world before the Flood, the latter at the beginning of the world after the Flood. Both are gifts of Divine goodness to the poor human race, and both glance back to a Divine judgment. Saved from God's judgment, in the Lord's Supper we receive in bread and wine the pledges of His grace.

"Take, eat; this is my body." What the disciples take and eat is His body. It is not merely bread (and wine). Rather of the bread (and wine) which He gives them He says, it is His body. It is not merely an

image and sign or pledge of His body. How could it be such? What would be the *tertium comparationis*? This the Lord would not say. Nor is the mere action of giving an image of spiritual giving, for the Lord speaks not of the action, but of the thing which He gives them. Rather, what they take and eat in taking and eating the bread is His body; in giving the bread He gives them His body; in receiving and partaking of the bread they receive and partake of His body, one in and with the other. And what is true of the bread and body is true of the wine and blood of the Lord.

Invisibly present, and working in a mysterious way, the Lord would feed us with His body and blood. When He departed from the earth He took with Him from the world to His Father nothing but His body and blood, His human nature, in which He reconciled and united us to God, and now sits at the right hand of the Father in the kingdom of glory. This His human nature He makes our food, that we, who live on earth in a body of weakness, may be made partakers of the salvation which He procured for us in the body and share in the strength and gladness which dwell in Him who died and rose again.

For what end does He give us His body and blood? It is His body which He surrendered to death and which is now glorified in heaven. His death is the propitiation for our sins, and our reconciliation with God. His glorification is the pledge of ours. His body, surrendered to death, is thus the security and pledge of our reconciliation; His glorified body is the earnest and pledge of our future glorification. The former should comfort us in thoughts of our sin, the latter give us joy in the prospect of death. Inasmuch as we live in a body of sin and death in this sinful and feeble human nature, we receive the Lord's body and blood, that we may have therein a

real and bodily pledge of our twofold salvation,—forgiveness and glorification,—and that our faith in salvation may thereby possess a firm point of support, from which to gain strength and cheerfulness.

Our receiving is through the Lord's giving, not according to the measure of our faith. For the very reason that we are weak, buffeted, in danger of falling, was this Supper instituted, that from it we may gain strength and confidence.

Through a world of sin and death we journey towards our heavenly home. For this journey through the desert the Lord has provided this table and this manna, until we shall one day eat and drink at His table in His kingdom. Thus in this Supper we show forth His death, which has conquered sin and death, until He come.

It is the same body, the same blood, which He gives us all alike ; it is the same food of which we all partake. Thus it forms a real bond, uniting us inwardly through our union with Him. In the Lord's Supper the Church of Jesus Christ on earth celebrates its fellowship with Him and its fellowship with itself. It is not merely a fellowship of the Spirit and spirits, it is also a fellowship of body and blood in which we stand with Him and with each other. "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in Me" (John xvii. 23). Glory to Jesus Christ for ever and ever. Amen.

C. E. LUTHARDT, D.D.

Leipzig.

II.

OUGHT we to regard the Communion, as the Catholics do, as a repetition of the redeeming sacrifice, in which we become partakers, through the host, of the actual body and blood of the Lord? It is not our purpose here to treat this question from a theological point of view; and we shall not therefore attempt anything like a complete discussion of it, which would indeed fill volumes.

Let us simply observe, first, that Holy Scripture lends no sanction whatever to the idea of a repetition of the redeeming sacrifice. We read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Nor yet that Christ should offer Himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year" (Heb. ix. 25); and again, "Every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifice, which can never take away sins: but this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." Could anything be more clear, more emphatic, than this? The sacrifice of the cross was unique, because it was perfect, and because it once for all reconciled heaven and earth. To suppose that it needs to be repeated is to suppose that something was wanting to it, and that Christ was mistaken when He cried, "*It is finished.*" It is to lower it to the level of the sacrifices under the old covenant; and this is what is really done by Catholicism, which arose out of a compromise between Christianity and Judaism, and which, attempting to restore the priesthood, was led at the same time afresh to set up the altar.

If the Communion is neither the repetition of the redeeming sacrifice, nor the communication of the real body and blood of the Lord, what, then, is it? It is the true sacrament of the Christian life, the sign and seal of the growing union between the disciple and the Master, the most sacred symbol of all the feelings implied in that union, its most solemn ratification by Christ Himself. It is the symbol of Christian love, the response to the love of God in redemption, the special token of the sublime interchange between the heart of man which gives itself to God, and the heart of God which gives itself to man.

What do the bread and wine say to the communicant but, first of all: "Thou hast sinned"? It was thy transgression which brought down from heaven the Prince of Life, and nailed Him to the accursed tree; for thee He hid not His face from shame and spitting; for thee He became the Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; bearing upon His innocent head the burden of thy condemnation, He trod amid mockery and scorn the way to Calvary. In drawing near to the Communion table, then, we acknowledge that we belong to the fallen race. This sacred feast is thus, primarily, the most expressive sign of the sense of sin, the most solemn and intense utterance of repentance.

Again, what do the bread and wine say to the communicant but this: "Thou art saved"? They tell of the price at which redemption was purchased—a price so vast that it must be adequate. They point to that great mystery of godliness which overwhelms our finite minds—the boundless love of God. They speak to us of the God who humbled Himself to become as one of us—the representative of guilty man, raising to His own lips the bitter cup of our ill-deserts, and drinking it to the dregs, while He exclaimed: "Father, not My will, but Thine be done." They tell us of the atonement for

our rebellion offered in His obedience unto death, and show us heaven opened above the darkness that hung around the cross. From the table of the Lord the voice sounds : " Go in peace ; thy sins are forgiven thee." To come to that table implies that we believe in and thankfully accept the pardon ; and the Communion, which is the expression of repentance, sets forth no less the joyous confidence of the redeemed soul, and is the witness of an assured faith.

" Greater love hath no man than this," says St. John, " that a man lay down his life for his friends." This is true love ; without sacrifice there is no love. Jesus Christ has taught us by His dying how we ought to live, and has given us an example that we should follow Him. The commandment of the new law, the commandment of love, was written with His blood, and from the cross He says to Christians : " Be ye followers of Me." To partake of the Communion is, then, to accept this law, to engage to follow this example, to seek after that holiness which is inseparable from love and sacrifice, and to pledge ourselves to strive with all our might after its attainment. To eat this bread and drink this cup is to acknowledge the direct constraint of the Saviour's love, and to say in effect, " If one died for all, then were all dead ; and He died for all, that we which live should not henceforth live unto ourselves, but unto Him who loved us and gave Himself for us." Love thus becomes the principle of our life, its rule, and its recompense. Thus the Communion is not only the forcible expression of repentance and faith, but, further, the pledge to holiness of life.

What, yet again, do the bread and wine say but this : " Feed upon Christ" ? It is not without significance that the tokens of redemption are borrowed from the commonest aliments of the bodily life. The Master thus teaches us that He Himself will be the daily bread of our

souls. Just as we do not receive once for all the bread for the body, so the soul needs every day to seek the heavenly bread. And just as the material food only nourishes us when we have assimilated it, so also does the heavenly food only nourish those who make it a part of their very being. We are, then, bidden to derive from Christ all our substance, all our life. Branches of the heavenly vine, we live only by that which it imparts to us, and as the Master Himself says, If we abide not in Him, we are cast forth and withered, and are fit only to be consumed. Thus the Christian life is not a mere imitation of Jesus Christ. It is the actual communication of His life to us ; and He is, as St. Paul says, "to dwell in our hearts by faith."

Lastly, what do the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper—that family-feast of the redeemed—say to us but this : "Love one another" ? Have compassion one of another with the same compassion which Christ has shown for you ; forgive one another, even as He has forgiven you. It was His will that this sacred feast should be taken together, and that it should remind us not only of the love which the Master claims from us, but also of that which we owe to each other. Enjoying the same pardon, as we had been under the same condemnation ; guests together at the same feast of reconciliation ; prodigal children having all sinned against the same fatherly love, and being all welcomed back by the same outstretched arms of forgiveness, what feelings can become us but those of mutual love, forbearance, and forgetfulness of injuries ?

The confession of sins, the glad acceptance of salvation, consecration of the heart to God, tender and compassionate love to our brethren—to all these acts and sentiments of the Christian life, the Lord's Supper gives emphasis and expression.

Every time, then, that we devoutly and thoughtfully partake of the Communion, we renew the most solemn vows of our Christian life. Can such a service be without beneficial results to us? It is impossible. It may often be that God calls the sinner and receives no answer; but it never can be that the sinner casts himself upon the Saviour and meets no response. Whenever the celebration of the Lord's Supper moves the Christian heart to earnest desire and humble, fervent prayer, it becomes to him one of the most effectual means of grace. The longings and strong affections awakened by this sacred feast find their final expression in the closing prayer of St. John: "Even so come, Lord Jesus, come quickly." And He will come. He is already here present at the sacred feast, and those who thus pray feel their hearts burn within them, as did the disciples on the way to Emmaus, when the Master was at their side. This is holy ground; it is the burning bush of the desert. We, too, believe in the real presence—a presence all the more real because not corporeal.

In the great solemnities of Papal Rome, I have seen the so-called head of the Church raise the sacred host beneath the vault of the great Basilica. I have seen the prostrate multitude, and have listened to the strains of wondrous music which floated by on the clouds of incense. But God was not in these material elements. While how often in breaking bread by the bedside of some humble Christian sufferer, I have felt that the Lord Himself was there, and the real presence was no mystic dream.

This is a glorious and solemn mystery. Woe to him who draws near to this table without having prepared himself! The apostolic word is, that he "eats and drinks condemnation to himself." There is no worse impiety than an unworthy participation in the Holy Communion. All that the feast contains of blessing for

the truly Christian soul is then turned into a curse. It is the most odious of profanations ; and if it be true that the Lord's Supper is the most solemn and sublime expression of piety, it follows that when piety is lacking, it must be the basest of lies—a lie uttered not to man, but to God.

E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D.

III.

IT has been the singular destiny of the Holy Communion, the dying gift of a dying Master, accompanied as it was with words of peace (St. John xiv. 27) and prayer for unity (St. John xvii. 21-23), to be the chief battleground of warring belief and practice amongst professing Christians. In a very distant age a dispute—lately revived anew—arose as to the matter to be used in its celebration, since the Gnostics rejected the cup of wine and replaced it with water ; while in process of time East and West were angrily divided as to the employment of leavened or unleavened bread. And a more serious difference on the doctrine of the Eucharist began, just a thousand years ago, in the rationalizing speculations of the acute Pantheist Joannes Scotus Erigena. With the double cause for new divergence found in the attempts made by the Schoolmen to define and formulate that which, as a spiritual mystery, is incapable of such mensuration, and in the gross practical abuses which grew up around the traffic in Masses throughout Latin Christendom, fresh conflicts arose ; while in the denial of human corollaries much rejection of the original Divine revelation has been unhappily involved. A new tradition, alien to the consciousness of all ancient Christendom, has grown up, and become dear to the minds of large bodies of believers, who accept it as though the primitive deposit of the Faith. One test, however, easily applied, is adverse to its claims on our acceptance. It can be readily understood that the work of the Holy Spirit, exhibited in its

principle of growth, may very well result in the increase of our *positive* knowledge of truth, not by the disclosure of fresh dogma, but by fuller deductions in theory and practice from that already revealed, just as indefinite mathematical progress is possible from the original and fixed store of definitions, postulates, and axioms. But a *negative* result, contradicting the accepted belief of Christians in the purest ages of the Church, and casting it away as false, is not to be looked for in the absence of a new revelation, though much excuse is to be found for it in the errors which begat the reaction. It is in exhibiting this negative quality—which so far seems in conflict with the Apostolic saying, “For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, was not yea and nay, but in Him was yea ; for all the promises of God in Him are yea, and in Him Amen” (2 Cor. i. 19, 20)—that the thoughtful and devout papers of Dr. Luthardt and M. de Pressensé, true and sound as they are in their positive assertions of Christian belief, display their human weakness, so that the head of gold ends in feet which are of mingled iron and clay. They severally represent the traditions of two great intellectual geniuses, Luther and Calvin, who have powerfully affected all subsequent theological speculation ; but they are not at one either with the belief of early Christianity (though Dr. Luthardt comes very close to that in all his positive statements) nor with the express indications which Holy Scripture, dispassionately investigated, supplies.

It may be noted by a close observer, that all which M. de Pressensé teaches positively is fully compatible with what Dr. Luthardt holds, and that they diverge only where the former begins to deny some of those tenets which are fundamental truths to the latter. And if a representative of the school of Zwingli and Farel were in turn to express his views, it would be seen that the in-

terval between him and M. de Pressensé is by no means so great as that which separates M. de Pressensé from Dr. Luthardt. These views (to which M. de Pressensé's in truth logically tend) regard the Holy Communion as a purely historical memorial, by sharing in which the communicants express their belief in the reality of the events commemorated, and which, as an acted sermon, works on their emotions so as often to influence their conduct. Now, the objection which lies against this theory—perfectly true in itself so far as it goes—is, that it is quite capable of being fully accepted by an atheist, who does not even believe in the historical existence of Christ as a mere human teacher, but who has sufficient philosophical insight to recognize the practical working of the Eucharist as a religious ordinance. A careful examination of M. de Pressensé's definitions makes plain, that on his showing the Holy Communion need not *necessarily* have any supernatural or Divine side at all. It has so to him, doubtless, but his words, transposed into a slightly lower key, denote no more than a human aspect—the stirring up of certain emotional feelings aroused by a symbolical act, which is also a record of a great event in the past; and they in no way exclude the sceptical view, that these feelings have not any basis in reality, but are simply the outcome of mere imagination. That is to say, it would be no very severe strain on a non-Christian to accept M. de Pressensé's explanation, whereas none but a Christian who had made much progress in faith and devotion could agree with Dr. Luthardt.

The following remarks are designed to be, if possible, irenical, and to show that there is no reason why the French divine should not accept the German's teaching, and the latter, in his turn, agree to symbolize with all ancient Christendom. Both writers are swayed in their denials by high and praiseworthy motives, each of them

desiring to vindicate the unique and unrepeatable character of the atoning Sacrifice on Calvary ; one of them, further, somewhat more definitely than the other (though both are in practical agreement here also), wishing to protest against worship being given to anything which is not God, and against any carnalization of spiritual ideas. But it is not the less true that both these ends could be better attained by following the highest and most praiseworthy way of all, that of simple acceptance of the whole Divine revelation, regardless of the consequences to which it may seem to lead, than by the eclectic method of choosing certain parts only of Holy Scripture which bear on the question, and passing over others, as conflicting with preconceived theories—a process visible in both the preceding papers.

Thus Dr. Luthardt, in order to establish his view that the Holy Eucharist is not, even metaphorically, a Sacrifice, first limits it to being only the New Testament Passover ; and then argues that the Old Testament Passover, which it replaces, was not a Sacrifice, but only a feast which presupposed a sacrifice, rescued by its covenant character from being a bare memorial of a past event. Now it is of course quite true that the Eucharist is the Christian Passover. We are not left to a mere deduction from the date of the first institution, since the Apostle has stated this clearly, saying, " Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast " (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). But as the Eucharist is a telling forth of the Lord's death until He come (1 Cor. xi. 26), it must needs so far sum up, and be proportionable to, *all* the Mosaic sacrifices which told that death forth before He came ; and as several of these, notably the Great Atonement (Lev. xvi.), were primarily sacrifices, and not feasts, any limitation of the Eucharist to replacing the Passover alone, implicitly denies their predictive and

Messianic import,* and contradicts the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. ix. 24 ; xiii. 10, 12). And next, it is a misleading ambiguity to refuse the title of "sacrifice" to the Passover feast. No doubt, there was not any mactation of the Paschal Lamb in the actual course of the banquet; but unless such mactation had taken place immediately before, so that the guests then and there ate of a sacrificial victim, the rite would have been invalid. And accordingly, even without taking the first institution into account (Exod. xii. 27), we find the Passover expressly described as a "sacrifice" in Exod. xxxiv. 25, and Deut. xvi. 2, 5, 6 ; in the first of which texts we have the noun זֶבַח, *zebhach*, and in the three latter the cognate verb זָבַח, *zabhach*, represented severally in the LXX. by θύματα and θύσεις, or θύσας, regarding which words no difference of opinion is possible. So, in the *ancient* ritual of the Passover, as recorded in the Talmud (*Pesachim*, X.), the master of the household was instructed to speak of the Paschal Feast as a sacrifice ; but in the *modern* rite, wherein no mactation of a victim takes place, and the feast is a bare commemoration, he is directed to pray that the Holy City may be rebuilt, so that his soul may there "eat of the thank-offering and of the Paschal Sacrifices," thereby confessing that the Jews do neither now.

The notion which underlies all sacrificial feasts, whether Jewish or Pagan, is that the offering serves as an intermediary of reconciliation with God, and that the offerers then, as His friends and guests, eat of that which has become the meat of His table—a view implied by St. Paul in his contrasted parallel between the Lord's table and the table of devils (1 Cor. x. 18-21). The mere association of ideas with a past event of a religious nature is not

* See, on the Christian meaning of all the Jewish sacrifices, the Rev. Andrew Jukes's thoughtful and pregnant work, "The Law of the Offerings in Leviticus."

enough ; otherwise the annual Christmas dinner of modern Christians would be a sacrificial feast in honour of the Nativity of Christ—a character which has never been attributed to it, since there is no previous oblation of its constituents. Unless, then, the Christian Passover have in it a sacrificial element, it sinks below the level of the ancient Jewish rite, and comes down to that of the modern one, which is now but the shadow of that which itself was only a type.

What indications, then, can we gather from Holy Writ as to the facts ? First comes that remarkable saying in the Psalter, with its singular wording, which is literally, “The oracle of Jehovah unto Adoni. . . . The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek ” (Psalm cx. 1, 4), glossed for us at much length in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as referring to Christ (Heb. vi. 20—x. 23), “consecrated for evermore ” (vii. 28). But when we refer back to the account of Melchizedek himself, we find that his offering was *bread and wine* (Gen. xiv. 18), which was clearly not mere food for the returning warriors, since verse 24 shows that the king of Sodom had provided that, or else that it had formed part of the spoil of Chedorlaomer’s army. Now, as Christ’s priesthood is for *evermore*, and did not end with His oblation on the Cross, He must, if a Priest of the order of Melchizedek, be actually offering bread and wine. He certainly does not do so in heaven ; and the inference is that He must in some way be doing it upon earth. But no way now known to us is conceivable save the Holy Eucharist. No argument adverse to this conclusion can be drawn from the absence of an express statement to this effect in the Epistle to the Hebrews, because the writer tells us that he is obliged to keep back much of what he has to say about Melchizedek, because of its difficulty and the dulness

of his disciples (Heb. v. 11). Does anything further point to this conclusion? One great Messianic prophecy implies it: "For thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before Me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually" (Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18).

To this High Priest inferior priests are to be added, for it is further written: "And I will also take of them (the Gentiles) for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord" (Isa. lxvi. 21). "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering: for My name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. i. 11).

Nor is there any conflict herein with the express declarations of the Epistle to the Hebrews, cited by M. de Pressensé, that Christ needs not *daily* to offer sacrifices, but "entered in *once for all* (*ἐφάπαξ*) into the holy place, having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, and thereby perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12; x. 12, 14). For the sacrifice of a victim consists of two parts, the mactation and the offering; nor does the sacrifice more than begin with the actual death of the victim. At least one if not two stages must follow—the solemn presentation of the oblation, and, sometimes at least, the feeding of the worshippers thereon. The whole argument in the Epistle to the Hebrews points to the Great Atonement in Lev. xvi. as the type fulfilled by Christ's Ascension. But in that rite the chief priestly act was not the slaughter of the victim, but the offering of its blood with incense in the Holy of holies (Lev. xvi. 12-17); at the close of which the high priest, putting on his splendid robes,

which he had laid aside previously, came out and blessed the people. In this sense, then, Christ's sacrifice is not yet over. He is still continually presenting Himself in heaven as Priest and Victim, and in the celestial ritual both the slain Lamb and the incense make their appearance (Rev. v. 6, 8 ; viii. 3). Now, the Great Atonement differed from the three other great yearly Jewish sacrifices in one important particular. The Passover, Pentecostal, and Tabernacle oblations were all *peace-offerings*, to be eaten by the worshippers. But the Great Atonement was a *sin-offering*, regarded as too sacred even for that use, since the blood had been brought into the Holy of holies (Lev. vi. 30). Contrariwise, we are told that this distinction does not apply to the great sin-offering of the Gospel : " We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come. By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name. But to do good and to communicate forget not : for with such sacrifices God is well pleased " (Heb. xiii. 10-16). And no explanation of these words, notably of the opening clause, has any plausibility save that which sees here the Christian Eucharist, and its feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ, sacrificially presented by " a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ " (1 Peter ii. 5).

Now, all these passages, when thus viewed as part of one connected whole, raise a very strong presumption in

favour of there being a sacrificial rite of some kind intended to continue amongst Christians. And here a very curious fact is noticeable, the total extinction under the Gospel of sacrifices as popularly understood; albeit the Jewish religion, out of which Christianity grew, was almost exclusively sacrificial, and sacrifice was the only really religious action in the creed of those Greek and Roman pagans who formed the great bulk of the earliest converts. Mohammedanism, the only other great proselytizing religion of ultimately Jewish origin, although having no sacrificial element whatever in its own teaching, has been unable to abolish the old pagan notions, and thus animal sacrifices even still form a regular part of the yearly feast of Bairam, and of the pilgrimage services at Mecca. No account of the contrast which Christianity presents in this respect is adequate, save that which sees in the Eucharist the means whereby this craving of man's nature was divinely satisfied, so that no survival of any other mode of sacrifice exists amongst Christians. Further, in the account of the first institution of the Last Supper, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, it is to be noted, not only that the Eucharist is brought into direct and necessary connexion with the sacrificial Passover meal, but that three words of sacrificial import are used by our Lord in reference to the bread and wine, themselves accustomed parts of the Jewish peace-offerings: "do" (ποιεῖτε), "covenant" (διαθήκη), and "memorial" (ἀνάμνησις). The verb ποίω occurs sixty-nine times in the LXX. in the sense of "sacrificing" or "offering," in all but four of which it represents the Hebrew אָסַח, *asah*; and in a large number of other cases it is used of "keeping" a feast, notably the Passover, which keeping of course includes offering the sacrifices. The second crucial word, New "Covenant"—not New Testament, according

to the misleading translation we have borrowed from the Vulgate—must needs have suggested Exod. xxiv. 8 to the Apostles, as we are certified by the parallel clauses in Heb. ix. 20, and xiii. 28, and thus must have pointed to a sacrificial use of blood in the new rite. And the third word, “remembrance,” “memorial,” *ἀνάμνησις*, occurs just five times in the LXX. Two of these are merely in titles of the Psalms, which are not certainly part of Holy Scripture, and one is in the Wisdom of Solomon, a book excluded from the Palestinian Canon. The two remaining ones are Lev. xxiv. 7, where the word denotes the frankincense laid on the shew-bread “for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord;” and Numb. x. 10, where the silver trumpets are to be sounded “for a memorial before God, over your burnt-offerings and over the sacrifices of your peace-offerings.” That is to say, *ἀνάμνησις* in one of these two passages denotes a sacrifice, and in the other a ritual adjunct of sacrifice. Clearly then, if the Eucharist were not designed as a sacrifice, everything tended to mislead the Apostles, who must needs have interpreted in the ordinary Jewish manner all they heard and saw; but no warning against error of the kind is recorded in the New Testament, nor does the idea seem ever to have so much as crossed the mind of any member of the ancient historical Churches of Christendom—our information as to the minor and obscurer separatist bodies is scanty—that the Eucharist was *not* a sacrifice, till Calvin denied it in the sixteenth century. There is entire unanimity on this head, and no trace of growth or development of the doctrine, in the Christian Fathers, from Justin Martyr downwards, and in the old Liturgies, some ninety in number, from the earliest, in at least the second century, to the latest in the sixteenth. Dr. Luthardt’s phrase, “Romish dogma,” is thus misleading, for the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a

dogma common to the whole of ancient Christendom, and is Romish only in the same sense that the doctrines of the Trinity, of the Atonement, and of the Resurrection are so.

Three brief citations, two of the second century and one at the beginning of the third, must suffice in illustration.

1. "The offering of fine flour . . . was a type of the Bread of the Eucharist, the doing of which our Lord Jesus Christ ordained. . . . Hence God speaks by the mouth of Malachi, one of the Twelve, . . . 'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, and I will not accept a sacrifice at your hands ; for from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same My Name has been glorified among the Gentiles ; and in every place incense is offered to My Name, and a pure offering : for My Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord, but ye profane it.' He thus speaks of the Gentiles, even us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, the Bread of the Eucharist and also the Cup of the Eucharist " (Just. Mart. [† circa A.D. 167], *Dial. c. Tryph.* xli.) This is especially noteworthy as the earliest Christian gloss on Mal. i. 11, where it may be remarked that the word for "offering," מִנְחָה, *minchah* (LXX., *θυσια*), is never elsewhere used metaphorically in the Hebrew Bible, but invariably means a material and tangible gift or offering, a fact which forbids us to allegorize it here. St. Irenæus, very soon after, quoting the same passage in the same sense, as pointing to the "new oblation of the new covenant," adds :

2. "The offering of the Eucharist is not a carnal one, but a spiritual one. . . . For we make our oblation to God of the Bread and of the Cup of blessing, . . . and then, having performed the oblation, we invoke the Holy Spirit, that He may make [*lit.* 'show,' or 'exhibit'] this

sacrifice, both the Bread as the Body of Christ, and the Cup as the Blood of Christ, that they who partake of these antitypes may obtain remission of sins and life eternal" (St. Irenæus [*†circa* A.D. 198], ed. Stieren, I. 854).

3. "'She [Wisdom] hath furnished her table.' That denotes . . . His undefiled Body and Blood, which day by day are offered [*ἐπιτελούνται*] on the mystical and Divine table, and are sacrificed as a memorial of that ever-memorable and first table of the mystical Divine Supper" (St. Hippolytus, *Fragm.* in *Prov.* ix. 2).

In the ancient Liturgies all these ideas are embodied, and they teach that there is first an oblation of bread and wine; that this bread and wine become by consecration the Body and Blood of Christ, which are then pleaded before God as propitiatory for the whole world; and are lastly fed on by the faithful for their pardon, strengthening, and refreshing.

Nor does this ever appear as though a repeated or a supplementary offering. It is always as a memorial of the One Sacrifice, mystically united with Christ's action in heaven, but in no way renewing His action on the Cross. And this is very forcibly brought out by the favourite epithet applied to the Eucharist of both Liturgies and Fathers, the "unbloody sacrifice." Now, as the cup of wine must needs symbolize the Blood of Christ, there seems at first sight a contradiction here. But it vanishes when we note that the Greek word is not *ἀναιμος*="bloodless," nor yet *ἀναιματος*="drained of blood," but *ἀναιμάκτος*="unbloodied," a word which excludes the notion of any fresh immolation, while it leaves untouched the Scripture doctrine that Christ not merely *was*, but still "*is* the propitiation for our sins" (1 John ii. 2). One ancient Liturgy, that of John of Basra, may well be cited here as bringing out this

double truth very forcibly. In the prayer wherein the words of institution are embodied, Christ is thus addressed: "Holy Priest . . . separate from sinners, Thou only-begotten Word of the Father . . . Who hast no need to offer daily many sacrifices, like those who discharge an earthly priesthood. For this Thou didst once for all, not [giving] another's blood, nor a sacrifice of corn, but gavest Thyself for us, and didst intrust a priestly ministry of like dignity to be established by the preachers of Thy Gospel." Then, after the consecration, the prayer is directed to the Father, and the celebrant, after saying that none of the legal offerings of the Mosaic code are brought, as being powerless, adds: "But having put on Thy beloved Son . . . we, through His great loving-kindness towards men, offer Him unto Thee as a pure and spotless oblation, and make Him our joint pleader." And St. Chrysostom more than once works out the same idea, telling us on the one hand that Christ is the only true Priest and offerer at every Eucharist (Hom. lxi., ad Antiochen.), and on the other that there are not many sacrifices, but only one, offered once for all, which we on earth continually offer, that is, commemorate and plead, yet not by way of mere symbol, but of intimate union with Christ's own continuous priestly action (Hom. in Heb. x.) So too the Wesleys teach in their wonderful Eucharist hymns, wonderful alike for their depth of meaning and for being produced at such a time. Here are two instances out of many:

- (1) "The sacrifice is all complete,
The death Thou never canst repeat,
Once offered up to die no more.

"Yet may we celebrate below,
And daily thus Thine offering show,
Exposed before Thy Father's eyes:

"In this tremendous mystery
Present Thee bleeding on the tree,
Our everlasting sacrifice." (Hymn 124.)

(2) "To Thee His Passion we present,
Who for our ransom dies ;
We reach by this great instrument
The eternal Sacrifice.

"The Lamb, as crucified afresh,
Is here held out to men ;
The tokens of His Blood and Flesh
Are on this table seen.

"The Lamb His Father now surveys
As on this Altar slain,
Its bleeding and imploring grace
For every soul of man." (Hymn 126.)

Thus, instead of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in any way implying the addition of anything to Christ's one offering, it teaches, as nothing else can, the perpetuity of His atonement, and the need of our offering all our prayers and thanksgivings through and with that. No doubt, the denial of the doctrine in the sixteenth century was due to reaction from manifold Roman abuses, amongst which was a popular opinion that each Mass was in some sense an independent offering, and separate from that of Calvary ; a view now generally repudiated even by the Roman Church ("Catech. Trident.," II. iv. 74). But, in order to allow of such denial, it is needful to pass over without adequate explanation, if not implicitly to contradict, the many passages of Holy Writ adverted to above. And it is not unworthy of mention, that whereas the genius of Calvin, the first impugner of the doctrine, powerfully influenced the greater part of Protestant Christendom for nearly three centuries, yet the moral sense of Christians has at last risen up everywhere against his *constructive* teaching, now repudiated almost universally, even in the communions of the Westminster

Confession. And if so, why should his *destructive* teaching be more regarded?

As to the *sacramental* aspect of Holy Communion, it can hardly be better expressed than by the Prayer of Humble Access in the English Common Prayer-Book: "Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us." With this Dr. Luthardt's teaching is in full accordance, while M. de Pressensé's seems to come much short of it. Indeed, the most curious feature about the latter's mode of stating his views is the very slender amount of corroborating evidence from Scripture which is capable of being adduced in their favour. Not that they are other than true in their positive parts, but that, even so, they are only indirect inferences from indirect hints of Scripture—they are not Scripture itself, pure and simple; while their negative positions are not easily reconcilable with several plain Scriptural assertions.

Thus, in M. de Pressensé's statement, the Holy Communion is not a commemoration of Christ's real Body and Blood. But then St. Paul says that it is, and that explicitly, with no guarding or qualification: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16). And this divergence from Scripture is even more remarkably demonstrated by M. de Pressensé in his warning to the unworthy communicant: "The apostolic word," says he, "is that he eats and drinks condemnation to himself." Is it not clear that the quotation stops short instinctively there, omitting the crucial words which follow: "not discerning [*i.e.*, discriminating] the Lord's

Body," because in truth they are not in agreement with M. de Pressensé's own belief, since being a phrase which, assuming it not to have been in Scripture, would never have crossed his mind? And what is extremely remarkable is, that our Lord did not give His disciples, bewildered by the strange language He used in St. John vi. 51-58, any such explanation as that often tendered now, that He was using only a figure of speech, and merely referred to acceptance of His doctrine. He suffered many of them to abandon Him, rather than dilute His words (ch. vi. 66); whereas, when the disciples, a little later, mistook the meaning of His metaphorical language on the death of Lazarus, He did explain Himself (St. John xi. 14).

Once more, while it is true enough that the Holy Eucharist is a symbol of the love of Christians to their Lord, no text of Scripture says so, still less that it is the token of the interchange between God's heart and man's. That is true also, but the New Testament does not say it. Nor, again, is it in Scripture that we find it described as a confession of faith and of sin, and a pledge of repentance. All that is true, in a sense, but it is wholly inferential. And while it is also true that the bread and wine symbolize the acts by which our redemption was purchased, yet, if they be merely symbols, we are still, like the Jews, under a dispensation of types and shadows, only retrospective instead of prospective. The Gospel revelation involves the objective reality of Christ's presence in His own ordinance, as to the mode of which all speculation is vain; while the attempt of the Schoolmen and their later successors to define, tabulate, and explain the mystery has resulted only in fresh difficulties to faith, and in further revolt from historical Christianity, which is as unanimous on this head as upon the Sacrifice. Now, the great practical difficulty in the way of accepting

M. de Pressensé's view as a whole is the extreme inadequacy, awkwardness, and, so to speak, dumbness, of such a ceremony as eating a morsel of bread and drinking a few drops of wine with the view of calling to mind such an event as Christ's death, and such a doctrinal system as the tenets regarding the effect of that death. A Scripture reading (say Isa. liii. or St. John xix.), or a sermon, or even a print of the Crucifixion, would be ten times more effectual for that purpose; though if the Holy Communion had been avowedly instituted in memory of the *Last Supper*, and of Christ's parting with His disciples, then it would be apt enough. But the New Testament never hints at such a solution. Nor is the Holy Communion devised in order to show *our faith* in Christ, except in so far as by our obeying His command. It is to show forth *His death* (1 Cor. xi. 26), to tell it before men, in the same sense that the Passover ritual included a proclamation of the deliverance out of Egypt; to tell it before God, as continually pleading that death as our ransom. And as regards the question of worship, raised in connexion with the Eucharistic mystery, it may be just pointed out that our Lord nowhere enjoins worship of Himself, though not rejecting it when offered. And it is the received doctrine of the Christian Church, that even the Sacred Humanity in itself, conceived of as apart from the hypostatic union with the Eternal Word, is not an object of worship, since it is a created thing, and only the Uncreated may be lawfully worshipped. Of course this extends even more definitely to the species of bread and wine in Holy Communion. They cannot be, and are not, objects of worship, which is directed solely to Him Who reigneth in the heavens, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, to Whom be glory for ever.

RICHARD F. LITLEDALE, D.C.L.

IV.

I DO not intend it as any reflection upon the writers of the preceding papers, but as a general remark, that in discussing the meaning, uses, or design of the Lord's Supper what we chiefly need is simplicity; and yet simplicity is precisely what we very seldom get in relation to it. It is too exclusively treated from the standpoint of the scholar, the theologian, or the priest, whereas it is almost entirely a matter for simple-hearted reverence and love. As a rule, too, it is too much connected with the sacrifice or death of Christ on Calvary, and with some theory of the way of salvation through His atoning blood; and yet, singularly enough, the Master Himself appeared to have nothing in His mind but a loving brother's desire to leave behind Him some pathetic memorial of a communion that was passing away, but only to receive the consecration of the heavenly world. Hence, His own words, "Do this in remembrance of me," contain the key-note of this touching sacramental psalm, and the secret of the meaning of it for them then, and for us now. In these words I find the uniting thought that seems to me lacking in Dr. Luthardt's paper. The Lord's Supper is both a memorial and a festival—a remembrance of something past and an act of communion in the present. Jesus loved, Jesus loves, this is our only creed in the "Sacrament." He cared for such as we are when He was upon earth; and He has gone "to prepare a place for us" in heaven. But Dr. Pressensé leads us still farther on, by suggesting the

fruitful thought that we are to commune with Christ in no selfish, care-taking spirit, as though our whole business was to be saved and "get to heaven." We are reminded by broken bread and poured-out wine of a fellowship in something besides bliss and victory. Heaven may be before us, and Christ may be there to welcome us, but struggle, and sorrow, and the cross, lie in our path; and in the "Sacrament" we pilgrim brothers and sisters remind ourselves and one another of it, and pledge ourselves to loyalty and love.

This simple and natural view of the Lord's Supper finds in it (I will not say imparts to it) all the sanctity that it requires, all the poetry it can fruitfully bear, and all the living reality needed to make it permanently useful. It also, on the one hand, saves it from being regarded as a mere memorial of a transaction, a sacrifice offered once for all, in which case it might become no more than the crucifix of the Catholic; and, on the other hand, it lifts it far above the "acted sermon" which, as Dr. Littledale says, even the Atheist, for the sake of its emotional uses, might accept. Dr. Littledale would have us go farther than the words of Christ Himself. He urges us to accept "the whole Divine revelation, regardless of the consequences;" and perhaps some one else would urge us, with equal earnestness and with not much less ground, to accept the development of the germ as it slowly grew in the early Church, until the act of communion became a symbol of partisanship or an offering of a sacrifice by the hands of a new mediator between God and man. The truth is, that within the covers of the Bible itself we find divergent views and tendencies on this as on other subjects; and therefore, especially as this is a matter that chiefly relates to our personal communion with Christ, the safest thing to do is to keep very near to Him, that we may lose as little of the sense

.

of personal attachment and personal reliance as possible. The danger of agreeing to Dr. Littledale's request, to accept "the whole Divine revelation" in relation to this subject, is immeasurably increased when we find that he actually includes the Old Testament, and that very doubtful passages from the Psalms, Jeremiah, and Malachi, are made the basis of an argument in defence of a peculiar view of the priestly nature and work of Christ. The Epistle to the Hebrews is infinitely more to the point than the Psalms, Jeremiah, or Malachi; yet even the Epistle to the Hebrews is of doubtful origin; but though we knew it to be the work of Paul, we should still have to remember that the argument is addressed to men of a particular type, in particular circumstances, and with a religious history behind them and religious associations around them of a particular kind, all of which determined both the form of his argument and the nature of his illustrations. No; for us the best thing we can do is to know Christ in the Lord's Supper, not as scholars, or critics, or theologians, or priests, or laymen, but as men and women who love Him and long to be like Him,—who believe that He was our own faithful brother on this earth, and who believe that He is not less but more our faithful brother now in heaven, mindful of our toils and sorrows and sins, and never more wishful than now to say to us—"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Dr. Littledale, in his anxiety to be scriptural and traditional, objects to what he regards as inferences. Thus, "while it is true enough," he says, "that the Holy Eucharist is a symbol of the love of Christians to their Lord, no text of Scripture says so." I am not so sure of that. The word "love" is not, indeed, in the tender central statement, "Do this in remembrance of me," but it might easily mean all that love most perfect could

say to love most sorrowful. What more could be said, if the dearest friend that ever loved desired to put into one brief broken word all his longing? and what remembered word would afterwards become a more tender and potent link of love? But in these matters, a counting of passages seems out of place, and the last thing to be said is—"Is it so nominated in the bond?" It may be not a departure from primitive ways and thoughts and feelings, but a return to them, if we are now learning to do without the problems of theologians and the mysteries or incantations of the priest; if we are gradually coming to feel that we can meet together on the common ground of a desire to be followers of One whom it would be heaven on earth to be like, and whom it will be heaven in heaven to see.

And so, continually, we find ourselves coming back to the dear old words, "Do this in remembrance of me." What, then, is involved in this remembrance of Jesus? and what, when He went away, would remembering Him mean to the men who knew Him best, and loved Him? *Now*, unfortunately, there are too many who affirm that remembrance of Jesus somehow involves the holding of well-defined and correct opinions concerning Him,—opinions, for instance, concerning His nature, His pre-existence, His miraculous powers, and His specific work; but we do not find that Jesus said anything of the kind: He, assuredly, said nothing of the kind to these poor followers of His, whose hearts were well-nigh broken with the dread mystery that hung about these last hours of His tarrying with them. Indeed, if we could have questioned them, some of us would probably have been startled to find how simple and few were their religious ideas. They were His disciples mainly because they loved Him, because He led them into the light of hope, because He plainly showed them the way to their Father in heaven.

Little enough did they trouble about His "nature;" enough for them to feel the boundless beauty and purity of it; and when they "remembered" Him, after He had gone, it would only be as loving brothers who would also bethink them of that other feast, to which men and women should come from the east and the west, the north and the south, and sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God. And yet see how men are destroying this spiritual conception of the Lord's Supper! here shutting out one for the sake of a name; here holding aloof from another because of a form; here even excommunicating a third because of a creed. Heaven help us! we almost need that Christ should come again, to redeem His own Church, and so teach us His heavenly lessons once more.

One thing we may be sure His disciples would remember—His goodness, His pure and beautiful life and spirit;—and this we could never remember beyond due measure. There is so much sin and sorrow on this earth, that life would become unbearable if it were not for the memories and the presence of these ministering angels of good, who bless the world, and keep the moral and spiritual atmosphere pure, even for those who know them not. Now Jesus was, unquestionably, an ideal of spiritual beauty to His disciples. They seemed to be absorbed with this consciousness of His peerless goodness; and even a man like Paul, who had never seen Him, lived and taught in the light of His resplendent purity. He it was who affirmed that Christ "knew no sin," and that He gave Himself for the Church "that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." He it was who gave us for all time that splendid description of the power of Christ's fellowship to uplift and purify those who "put off con-

cerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," and are "renewed in the spirit of their minds," and who "put on the new man which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness;" and that beautiful description of Christ Himself as giving Himself for us "an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." And Peter, who *had* seen Him, called upon his hearers and readers to follow Christ on the very ground that He "did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth," and to "arm themselves" with the same mind, that they might win the same victory over sense and sin, and find their place as "living stones" in "the spiritual house," the "holy priesthood," whose lives should be a showing forth of the praises of Him who called them "out of darkness into His marvellous light." We, at this distance, may be unable to fully enter into the meaning of the saying that He "did no sin," and may find it enough to retain Him as our ideal of spiritual purity; but, whether as perfect man or perfect ideal, the effect is the same for us. He is before us, not behind us; and the broken bread and poured-out wine remain as profound symbols of the conditions of His purity and the way to our own. Well for us if *we* also remember Him as the first disciples did; and if men "take knowledge" of *us* that we have "been with Jesus"!

Not less would they remember Him as the gracious helper and friend of all who were in need. They themselves had been gathered in by His winning voice, and strong but brotherly hand. They had known, actually known as we can never know, what it really meant to find rest by coming to Him: so much so that they left all to follow Him; and Peter only spoke for them all when he said, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." Truly, Jesus *was* their

Saviour ; for He had led them, as Peter said, "out of darkness into His marvellous light." And it was so for all with whom He came into contact—except the "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." "He came to seek and to save that which was lost." "He went about doing good." In Him was wonderfully realised that great description of the earthly minister of heavenly grace,—“When the ear heard me, then it blessed me ; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me : because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me ; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.” Poor Himself, He loved the poor ; and, as His divine apology for consorting with the wretched, said, “They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick ;” “I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance.” Blind beggars by the wayside could stop this heavenly King ; and when His disciples thought the Jewish mothers disturbed Him in pressing forward with their little ones, that He might take them in His arms and bless them, He raised them and the action up to heaven, and made the scene divine, by saying, “Of such is the kingdom of heaven.” And when the men, some of whose little children He perchance had blessed, cried, “Crucify Him !” and drove Him up the hill to die, He looked upon them with an infinite pity, and prayed for them with an infinite love,—“Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do !” Can any one doubt that *these* are the things the disciples would “remember” ?—that these are the scenes that would be recalled to mind when, in His absence, the old simple festival of communion reminded them of the things that once made Him all in all to them ? But these are things that time cannot change, and that distance cannot cause to fade away. Still can we walk with Him in spirit, and open

our souls to His surpassing tenderness and love ; still is it possible for us to make triumphant in ourselves the spirit and the actions that have long received the name of " Christlike " ; and still these symbols may show us, it is by no cheap and easy path that we must go if we would be His, in patient, faithful service, where even the doing of good is often the carrying of a cross.

But, in all probability, the inmost significance of the Lord's Supper to the first disciples was its connection, not with the dead Christ at all, but with the living Christ, soon to be restored to them, or to whom they would soon be restored. It was a pregnant saying of Paul's, which few writers on this subject can pass by,— " As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come ; " and that other saying, by Jesus Himself, is not less important here,— " I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." We shall only comprehend this as we perceive how absorbed both Jesus and His disciples were with the immediate future. It is perhaps an open question whether He and they alike believed in the speedy literal ending of the world, but it is hardly an open question whether they dwelt almost exclusively on their personal relations with one another. We must therefore associate this touching request to be remembered, rather with a personal affection and expectation of re-union than with a far-reaching intention to establish a ritual for all time. It was the word of a brother, not the decree of a Church-creator ; it was the cry of yearning love, not the command of authority ; it was rather a token of affection for them than the establishment of a rite for us. We must connect it most closely with the discourses that precede and follow it, which, whether they are really inspired reports of what Jesus said, or the saintly

recollections of one who dearly loved Him, or the reverent interpretations of cherished traditions, in any case bring us as near to the spirit of the Lord's Supper as anything can do. And what do we find? Long, confidential, loving personal outbursts of consolation in the presence of this dark shadow of approaching separation. "Little children," He began, "I shall be with you only a little while; and I am going where you cannot yet follow me. But let not your hearts be troubled; for I am only going to prepare a place for you; and I will come again to you, that where I am, there ye may be also. I shall still live, and you shall live too. Therefore, let not your hearts be troubled, neither be ye afraid. If you understood and loved me, you would rejoice because I said I go unto the Father." And so forgetting or not speaking of His own great sorrow, He strove to comfort them: and this "Do it in remembrance of me" supremely meant, Do it in remembrance of one who has only gone beyond the veil—of one who will there prepare a place for you, and presently give you a brother's welcome there.

If I say that this suffices me, I doubt not there will be many who will think it lamentably incomplete; but each one must walk in his own path, and by the light that is his. For one, I take Jesus at His word. I actually and literally believe that in the unseen world He lives as of old, to seek and to save the lost; that He still goes about doing good; and that for the millions of poor, dark, miserable souls who on earth never found a Jesus or any one at all like Him, He still is, and will be, teacher, guide, and saviour. I actually and literally believe that He meant what He said, and will do what He said, and that He is even now, with myriads of Christlike spirits attending Him, preparing a place for us. I actually and literally believe that Jesus said what every dear brother, or sister, or father, or mother, or child might say; and

that these do now what He said He would go to do. The good mother who loved her child here is not forgetting it there, but is preparing the home in heaven even as her motherly hands prepared it on earth ; the dear child who left its little nest below for the Father's home above, for whom we once prepared a home, is now doing the same for us ; and all who delighted in our fellowship here are preparing for its renewal there. Yes ! dear forerunners to the heavenly shore, we will remember you ; and if remembrance lingers over the symbols of your conflict and agony now long past, it will only be to hearten us for ours that are yet to come, and to make our sacrament a triumph, that we may carry our cross as a sacred burden to the end.

JOHN PAGE HOPPS.

Leicester.

V.

TO an ordinary reader of the Bible nothing is more unaccountable than the widely different views which have been taken of the nature and objects of the Lord's Supper, and the protracted controversy which it has occasioned for nearly a thousand years. But in the course of the following observations I think it will appear that, if there is no real difficulty in discovering what the New Testament teaches on this subject, there is enough in the tendencies of men's minds to account for the very different way in which this teaching has been read, and is read, to the present day. Before we can intelligently judge between the different schools of interpretation on this subject, we must first see what the facts of the case are, as brought out in the New Testament.

We have four accounts of the institution of this ordinance—one in each of the first three Gospels, and one in the Epistle to the Corinthians ; and since the Apostle tells us that this last account was imparted to him directly by his glorified Lord (1 Cor. xi. 23), we naturally turn to it first. And what do we find ? Not only is it a fuller account than any of the others, but it specifies with remarkable precision the *object* which the Lord had in view in instituting it. Twice over this is done—with reference to each of the elements. With reference to the Bread—"This is my body, which is broken for you : *this do in remembrance of Me.*" With reference to the Cup—"This cup is the new testament ('covenant') in My blood : *this do ye*, as oft as ye drink it, *in remembrance*

of *Me*." Nay, in the words that follow the same idea is repeated in a slightly varied form. Recalling the previous words "as often"—for the purpose of adding the delightful piece of information, that the observance of this ordinance is to go on till the Lord's return in glory—he puts it thus: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim (so the word is) the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 24-26).^{*} To bring to "remembrance," then, "the Lord's death"—or rather the Lord Himself in His death ("in remembrance of *Me*")—this was the specific object of the Lord's Supper. Of the "proclamation" of that death by this observance I will speak presently; but it is to the *memorial* intent of it that I wish attention to be first called, as that which is here emphatically held forth. Turning now to the three accounts of it which we have in the Gospels, which of them (where they differ from each other) should we presume would be most in accord with that of the Apostle to the Corinthians? Surely that of Luke, who for many years was the close companion of that Apostle, and could not fail to know whence he derived his account of that ordinance. Accordingly, we find that it is he alone of the three Evangelists who specifies any *purpose* at all of this ordinance; and how is that purpose expressed? Why, in the identical terms which the Redeemer Himself used to the Apostle:—"This do in remembrance of *Me*" (Luke xxii. 19).

Since, then, "to bring to remembrance" the glorious Object there set forth is the one *specified* design of the Lord's Supper; this, beyond all dispute, must be held to be the *fundamental and dominating* idea of it:—all other ideas which it is designed and fitted to call forth

^{*} I take no notice of the various readings here, as they have no bearing on our question.

must be such as *spring out of* this and are *in harmony with* it ; and whatsoever ideas are *not* of this nature must be regarded as alien from its Divine intention.

First, then, the Lord's Supper is a COMMEMORATIVE ordinance. But since how much this embraces is apt to be overlooked, we note—

(1) It not only "proclaims the Lord's death" as a *historical fact*, but since in all the accounts of its institution His resurrection is pre-supposed, it "proclaims" at the same time that "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more : death hath dominion over Him no more." It is thus a grand testimony held forth to the world—from the very day of Pentecost to this hour, in every land where Christians are found, a continuous unbroken chain of testimony—to the two great historical facts on which the whole truth of Christianity rests, the *death* and *resurrection* of Jesus Christ. To all who have ears to hear, the language of those symbols to devout communicants in every age has been, "I was *dead*, and behold I am *alive* for evermore." Nor is there any evidence of Christianity as a *historical* religion more telling than this.

(2) In partaking of this ordinance the devout communicant recalls the fact, that by that death he has himself been "redeemed unto God." Since all the accounts expressly mention, that when the Lord took bread and gave thanks, "He *brake* it," it is plain that this was no mere preliminary act, but an essential feature of the ordinance, considered as a *teaching* rite ; proclaiming that we are reconciled to God, not by the *life*, but by the *death* of Christ. "Take, eat: this is My body, which is *broken for you*: this do in remembrance of Me.—This cup is the new covenant in My blood, which is *shed for you*." The whole interest of Christians in the celebration of this ordinance lies here. The bare

fact, though the grandest, perhaps, in the world's history, would never have availed to bring Christians together in every age and land for its commemoration. It is the thrilling words "*for you*" that, like a mighty magnet, draw them to that *visible expression* of all their deepest interests, joys, and hopes—"Christ crucified," as it were, "before their eyes." Yes, says the devout communicant, as he eats of that bread and drinks of that cup, "Thou wast wounded for my transgressions; Thou wast bruised for my iniquities. The chastisement of my peace was upon Thee, and by Thy stripes I am healed." But this opens up another idea in this ordinance.

Secondly, the Lord's Supper is a SIGILLATIVE or SEALING ordinance.

And this sealing is mutual. As faith discerns Christ coming to us in the instituted symbols of His dying love, it hears the voice of "the Lamb as it had been slain," from "the midst of the throne, saying to us, 'That thrilling moment we here mutually recall, when to thy ravished soul I first disclosed to thee My dying love, and when thou saidst to Me, O Lord, I am Thy servant, Thou hast loosed my bonds, and, now, over these memorials we mutually renew and *confirm* this pledge; herein afresh I seal myself Thine and Thou mine.' " Nor is it only as springing out of the nature of the ordinance that we gather this *sealing* character of the Lord's Supper. The very term is employed by the Apostle in the perfectly analogous case of Circumcision. "We," said the Jews, "as Abraham's seed, were made the Lord's people by circumcision, and thus only can any become such." "Nay," says the Apostle, "Abraham was the Lord's, as justified by faith, long before he was circumcised; and he received the *sign* of circumcision, a *seal* of the righteousness which he had while he was yet uncircumcised'" (Rom. iv. 11). Once more—

Thirdly, the Lord's Supper is a NUTRITIVE and INCORPORATIVE ordinance.

It is quite conceivable that had *commemoration* been alone in view, that object might have been attained without requiring the elements to be partaken. The holding forth of the Bread and the Cup before the eyes of the disciples, with the words, "This is My body, broken for you; this is My blood, shed for you: this *see ye* (or *do ye*) in remembrance of Me," might, in some faint way, have answered the purpose. But beyond all reasonable dispute, to *nourish* the souls of communicants, as well as to bring to their "remembrance the Lord's death till He come," was the design of this ordinance. For (1) BREAD—"that *strengtheneth* man's heart"—and WINE—"that *maketh glad* the heart of man" (Psalm civ. 15)—being the elements employed to represent the body and blood of Christ, the strengthening and gladdening of the soul on Christ's atoning death, as its proper *food*, is at once seen to be designed. And when the Lord said, "Take, *eat*: this is My body, broken for you;" "This cup is the new covenant in My blood, shed for you: *drink ye* all of it," the thing speaks for itself. (2) Why is it called "The Lord's *Supper*," if it is not a *meal*? I am almost ashamed to insist on this, so obvious is it. But with a large class of superficial theologians every view of this ordinance seems to be sunk in the one primary object of it—commemoration.

Much light is thrown upon this nutritive and incorporative character of the Lord's Supper by the stern rebuke which the Apostle administers to those Corinthian converts who—on pretext that all food is allowable to Christians—virtually identified themselves with the religion of their heathen fellow-citizens, by partaking with them, in their very temple, of things known to be sacri-

ficed to idols. As in the Lord's Supper, "the cup which we bless is a communion of (or 'participation in') the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break is a communion of ('participation in') the body of Christ;" even so "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils ('demons'), not to God;" and surely "ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; ye cannot partake of the Lord's table and the table of devils." (See 1 Cor. x. 15-22.) The argument is, that in both cases by "partaking of the table" we *drink into the religion* there represented, and *identify ourselves with the object* celebrated.

Such, then, are the fundamental ideas which the New Testament seems clearly to teach regarding the Lord's Supper. If we pass over another object certainly designed—the open manifestation and more vivid realization of *the oneness of all that are Christ's*—Greek and Jew, barbarian, Scythian, bond and free, in virtue of their common union with the one Lord of all—it is not because of its insignificance, or because the primary ends designed had obscured it in the Apostle's view. For in the very argument we have just referred to it comes prominently out. "The bread which we break, is it not a partaking of the body of Christ, seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread" (ver. 17). But on this there is no need to dwell, as there is no dispute about it.

Let us now test, by these teachings of the New Testament, the different theories which have formed the subject of such keen and protracted controversy.

I. On two points the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches are at one. They both hold and teach that, **after** the consecration of the elements, the true, natural, material body of Christ is present in the Lord's Supper. The former Church expresses this more nakedly and

crassly, but not more explicitly, than the latter.* But whereas the Church of Rome maintains that, after consecration, the elements of bread and wine have *ceased to exist*, save in their form (or appearance); the Lutheran Church "rejects and condemns the Papistical Transubstantiation, that in the holy Supper the bread and wine lose their substance and natural essence, and so are annihilated."† "And whereas the Church of Rome teaches, that in the Eucharist there is offered a true and proper

* "By the consecration of bread and wine" (says the Roman Church) "a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the whole substance of the wine into His blood: which conversion is conveniently and properly termed Transubstantiation by the holy Catholic Church" (Decret. Concil. Trid. Sess. xiii. c. 4, *De Transsubstantione*). "If any one shall say (referring to the Lutherans) that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine along with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, there remaining merely the species (appearance or form) of bread and wine . . . let him be anathema" (Canon ii., *De Eucharistia*). "The pastors must teach not only that the very body of Christ, and whatsoever properly belongs to a body, such as flesh and nerves, but also whole Christ, is contained in this sacrament" (Catech. Conc. Trid., *Questio xxxi.*)

Hear now the Lutheran Church: "We believe, teach, and confess that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken together with the bread and wine" (Form. Concord., Art. VII. *Affirm.* i.) "We believe, teach, and confess that the words of Christ's Testament are to be no otherwise received than as the words themselves literally sound" (Art. II.), "that the body and blood of Christ are taken with the bread and wine not only spiritually through faith, but also by the mouth, yet not Capernaitically, but after a spiritual and heavenly manner, by reason of the sacramental union" (Art. VI.)

† Form. Conc. *Negat.* i.

sacrifice for the sins both of the living and the dead, and that this sacrifice is one and the same with that offered upon the cross; the difference being, that the one was a bloody, the other an unbloody sacrifice, the offerer also being different—"* the Lutheran Church "rejects and condemns the papistical sacrifice of the Mass, which is offered for the sins of the living and the dead."† But since both these Churches hold that the real, natural body is present in the Lord's Supper, and partaken of "by the mouth," it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the Lutheran Church, no less than that of Rome, holds, that "all those who use this sacrament, be they worthy or unworthy, good or bad, believers or unbelievers, take the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, yet in such wise that unbelievers take it unto condemnation."‡ The one thing common both to the Roman and Lutheran Churches is their doctrine of a *material presence* of Christ in the Supper.

II. The Reformed Church—including those of Switzerland, the Netherlands, France, parts of Germany, England, and Scotland—teaches, in opposition both to the Roman and Lutheran Churches, that in the Lord's Supper there is no *material presence* of Christ; that this institution was designed to represent and set forth, through the senses to the minds of believing communicants, the one sacrifice for sins which perfects for ever them that are sanctified; that while there is nothing actually on the communion-table but bread and wine, the faith of the communicant, piercing through the outward elements to Him of whom they are the instituted symbols, sees "Jesus Christ evidently set forth crucified before his eyes," and, opening his soul to this present

* Decr. Conc. Trid. Sessio xxii. 2.

† Form. Conc. Negat. ii.

‡ Ibid., *Status Controv.*

Lord, in all the glory of His finished work, does there "eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man," realizing the sacrificial virtue of His death to bring into his soul, at each communion, a fresh sense of that pardon and peace with God, that access to Him as a reconciled Father, that newness of life and hope of glory which he first tasted in the day when old things passed away with him and all things became new. In proof of this, instead of quoting from the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, I simply appeal to those who are familiar with them, whether this is not what they all teach on this subject, each in its peculiar manner. Of the alleged difference between the Eucharistic views of Zwingli and Calvin I shall have something to say further on. Meantime I simply affirm, that between these great Reformers there exists on this subject no real difference at all.

On the *sacrificial* theory of the Lord's Supper I have not much to say, but it is very decisive. (1) Referring to the remarkable passage already quoted from, on the *nutritive* design of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. x. 15-22), I venture to say, that, if anywhere, the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper—if such were its true character—might be expected to stand prominently out here, as strengthening the Apostle's argument. But, instead of a *sacrifice*, we have a *feast upon a sacrifice*—a vastly different thing—a feast, too, not laid upon an *altar*, but spread upon a "table," just as the idolatrous feasts were in the idol-temple. In fact, the word "altar" is never used in the New Testament to express the piece of furniture on which the elements in the Lord's Supper were placed; for no one who understands exegesis will call Heb. xiii. 10 an exception. And considering how frequently the Old Testament sacrifices are alluded to in the New Testament in immediate connection with the sacrifice of Christ can this avoidance of all that could

suggest a *sacrificial* character in the Lord's Supper be other than intentional? In short, if the Lord's Supper is *not* a sacrifice, the New Testament way of speaking of it is just what we should expect: if it *is* a sacrifice, its language is unaccountable. (2) The shifts to which the advocates of this theory are put in their attempts to explain the relation of the Eucharistic sacrifice to that of the Cross are enough to show the baselessness of the whole theory. Sometimes they are represented as virtually one and the same sacrifice. But when you ask what that "virtually" means, you get no intelligible answer. Nor are they a whit more intelligible when they represent it as a *memorial* sacrifice; for if it be, in any proper sense, *the same* sacrifice, how can it be a *remembrance* of what is *actually present*? Further, if it be a real sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, how can that consist with the explicit statement of Scripture, that "by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified"? And if it is explained that it does not do exactly what the "one offering for sins for ever" did, pray what else does it do? But above all, when, to distinguish the two sacrifices, they say that that on the cross was a *bloody* sacrifice, but the Eucharistic one is *unbloody*, what are we to make of the great principle that "without shedding of *blood* there is no remission"? I cannot stay here to argue with those in the English Church, commonly known as the ritualistic party, who contend for the consistency of the sacrificial theory with the articles of their own Church. I will here only say, Romanism I know, and Protestantism I know, but who are ye?

To the one great question which divides the Reformed Churches alike from the Church of Rome and the Lutheran Church—commonly known as the "Real-

Presence" doctrine—I will devote the rest of this discussion.

1. To me nothing is more surprising than that the words, "Take, eat: this is My body, which is broken for you," should by any one be understood literally, and held to teach either (with the Church of Rome) that, after consecration, the literal bread and wine have disappeared, the literal, material body of Christ alone remaining; or (with the Lutherans) that, along with the elements, Christ's literal body is there. When we read in the very next verse, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," does any one take that literally? We have no need to fall back upon the figurative character of Oriental phraseology, or upon such sayings of our Lord Himself as "I am the door," "I am the vine"; for the same way of speaking is familiar to ourselves, and needs no explanation. In turning over the pages of a photographic album, or looking at the portraits on our walls, we have no need to say, "This is a portrait of my father," and "That is a representation of my mother." Enough it is to say, "This is he," and "that is she," without the danger of any but a fool misunderstanding us. In no other sense, I hold, can any unprejudiced mind understand the words "This (bread) is My body"; "this cup is the new covenant in my blood."

2. When we ask, What is *meant* by the "real presence" of Christ in the Supper? we get no intelligible answer. It will not do to say, as is continually done, "We pretend not to explain *how* Christ is substantially present in the Eucharist; enough for us to believe the *fact*." For what we ask you to explain is, not the *manner* of Christ's presence, but what you mean and understand by the *fact* of that presence; and you cannot tell us. Luther, at the famous Marburg Conference with the Swiss divines, Zwingli and Œcolampadius (in 1529),

when hard pressed with this question, lost his temper, and only thundered out again and again, "This is My body," thumping with his hand upon the table, and writing these words with chalk upon the cover. His amazed opponents could only reply, "The words must *mean* something, and to refuse to say what he understood by them was senseless—but was not surprising ;" for the question, I think, would baffle any one. Such writers as the late Bishop Forbes of Brechin, in attempting it, escape in a cloud of words, saying that Christ is present, strictly speaking, neither physically nor spiritually, but *hyperphysically* (whatever that word may mean); and some try to illustrate this by referring to the mysterious qualities of His resurrection body during the forty days of His stay on earth; but surely it was a literal body, with physical laws, though, as contrasted with His animal body in "the days of His flesh," it is styled by the Apostle "a spiritual body." Bucer—in a noble letter to Melancthon, when both of them were at Augsburg during the great Diet of the Empire held there in 1530, and the Protestant princes of the Empire appeared before the Emperor to defend their faith—tried to show him, in words to which we request attention, "how little real difference there was between them on this subject, if Melancthon's expression of his views and his own were brought together. We take our Saviour to witness, that between that presence of Christ which consists (as Zwingli writes) in *the contemplation of faith*, and that which you hold to be *real* indeed, yet *not local*, we discern no difference, or at least very little, and *such as while we seek for it escapes us*" [aut nullum aut certe pertenuē, quodque dum quæritur evanescat, discrimen].

But the difficulty is increased when we observe the light in which the Lord Jesus would have Himself viewed

this ordinance. It is not His "body" simply, but His body as "*broken for us*," that He would have us see in the "bread." Now can the *death* of Christ be said to be present at the Table in any real, actual, material sense—in any intelligible sense save *spiritually* to the *faith* of the communicant? The Lutheran Church, in that article of the "Form of Concord" which we quoted, would seem to say, No. Well, either they meant no more—and in that case they contended shamefully against the Reformed *for nothing*, excluding them resolutely from all participation in the toleration which they claimed for themselves—or, if they did mean more, they were unable to explain what it was.

3. I must apply the same remark to the Real-Presence theory of the Lutherans and High Anglicans that I made to the sacrificial theory of the Church of Rome—that it is hard to see how we can "do this in *remembrance* of" a *present Object* and *present sacrifice*. To remember one not present in his actual, substantial form is intelligible enough; but to remember an actually present person is to me not intelligible. And, as said at the outset, since the *memorial* object of the Supper was its primary, and therefore dominating, object, any idea of it not in entire harmony with this primary idea, and not springing natively out of it, must be regarded as untenable.

4. In the Corinthian Church, among other abuses, which the Apostle wrote his First Epistle to correct, their mode of observing the Lord's Supper was one of the most distressing, as to us it seems almost incredible. "I praise you not" (he says), "in that ye come together not for the better, but for the worse. . . . When ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper. For in your eating each one eateth before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat

and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." Then, after his own well-known account of the Institution, he adds, "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together, wait one for another. If any man is hungry, let him eat at home: that your coming together be not unto judgment" (1 Cor. xi. 17, 20-22, 33, 34). Now, in the light of these strange abuses let us consider out of which of the two main theories of the Lord's Supper they would most naturally spring. Suppose the Apostle to have taught at Corinth that the body of Christ, in its natural substance, was, after consecration, actually present on the table—whether by the disappearance of the elements (according to Rome) or along with the elements (according to the Lutherans), is of no consequence to our present argument: what sort of abuse would this teaching be likely to generate? Could the Corinthians, so taught, possibly confound it with an ordinary meal, and come dropping in one after another, each to satisfy his own appetite? Is the thing conceivable? Rather, if they but realized what they were taught, that Christ Himself was corporeally before them on the Communion Table, would they not draw near with an awe approaching to dread, as they took into their hands so "tremendous a mystery" (as the phrase is *)?

* The following account of part of the ceremonies with which Archbishop Laud consecrated the Creed Church (that of St. Catherine Cree), when he was Bishop of London, on 16th January, 1630, was attested on oath before the Lords by eye-witnesses at the Archbishop's trial. (It is an extreme case, doubtless, but all the better will it illustrate the *tendency* of the Real-Presence theory.) "As he approached the Communion Table, he bowed very near to the ground six or seven times; and coming up to one of the corners of the Table, he there bowed himself three times, then to the second third, and fourth corners, bowing at each corner three times; but

But since the very opposite of this was what the Corinthians did, we confidently affirm that no such view of the Lord's Supper *was* or *could have been* taught at Corinth by the Apostle. Let us next try the other theory, bringing it, too, face to face with the Corinthian abuses. According to that theory, the Apostle taught that nothing is on the Lord's Table from first to last but bread and wine, and that Christ is present there only to the faith which realizes it through the instituted symbols. In that case, of course, unbelieving and unspiritual communicants would discern no Christ there at all, nor draw forth through it aught of His fulness, as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Even real converts, but slightly affected with the death there held forth, and the glory of His promised presence there, would pay more attention to the outward scene, in its varied arrangements and impressive actions, than to that

when he came to the side of the Table where the Bread and Wine were, he bowed himself seven times ; and then, after reading many prayers by himself and his two chaplains, (they all this time on their knees by him, in their surplices, hoods, and tippets,) he himself came near the Bread, which was cut and laid in a fine napkin, and then he gently lifted up one of the corners of the said napkin and peeped into it, till he saw the Bread, and presently he let it fall, and flew back a step or two, and then bowed very low three times towards it and the Table ; when he beheld the Bread, then he came near and opened again, and bowed as before. Next he laid his hand upon the gilt cup, which was full of Wine, with a cross upon it. So soon as he had pulled the cup a little nearer to him, he let the cup go, flew back, and bowed again three times towards it. He approached it again, and lifted up the corner of the cup and peeped into it. Seeing the wine, he let fall the corner, flew nimbly back, and bowed as before. After these and many other gestures, he himself received, and then gave the sacrament to some principal men, only they devoutly kneeling near the Table." (Prynne's "History of the Trial," etc., folio, London, 1646, p. 114.)

which it was designed to convey. Above all, since we know that the celebration of this ordinance was associated with an *ordinary meal*, would there not be a great danger of superficial communicants, in humble circumstances, "forgetting that they had houses of their own to eat and drink in," and coming to the Lord's Table rather to satisfy the cravings of nature than to "show forth the Lord's death"? Beyond all reasonable doubt, if *any such* abuses did creep in as we find existed at Corinth, this second theory is that which alone could explain it. On the other theory we hesitate not to say the thing is inconceivable.

It only remains that I refer to the alleged difference between the views of Zwingli and those of Calvin on this subject. As a mere historical question, however interesting, this would claim no attention in the present paper. But since it enters into the essence of the question, and helps to clear away obscurities and misconceptions, I must give, somewhat fully, the facts of the case—which are but indistinctly known even by those who profess to have studied the subject, and not quite accurately stated by those who are certainly entitled to speak.

(1) Those of the Reformers who opposed Luther's views on the Sacrament—not only the Zürichers, but those of Bern, Basel, Schaffhausen, and most towns on the Upper Rhine—had found it necessary to dwell on the nature of Christ's *presence* in the Eucharist, since that would determine the nature of the Eucharistic *participation* in His body and blood—their curt maxim being, "As is the *presence*, such is the *participation*." Hence their adversaries plausibly alleged, that in their eagerness to refute the *corporeal* presence they explained away the presence itself, and consequently all sacramental

participation in the flesh of a present Saviour. And some, no doubt, did so. When Calvin, therefore—who did not come to Geneva till a good many years after Zwingli's death—saw the ill-effects of this unhappy controversy, and the too partial way in which the subject had been treated even on his own side, he set himself to a more comprehensive development of the whole subject, especially in its deeper and richer aspects. But he soon found the difficulty of the task. For, having, in his first express publication on this subject (*"De Cœna Domini"*), gained the good opinion of Luther himself—who condescended, in his patronizing way, to think him not far from the truth—he thereby only strengthened the suspicions of the Zürichers (including even the younger Bullinger) that he was going over to the Lutheran camp. To remove these unfounded suspicions, though crushed by the recent death of his wife, Calvin took a journey to Zürich early in the year 1549, and held a Conference with the ministers, which lasted several days, in presence of the Civic Council, on all the points on which the French-speaking Swiss were supposed to differ from their German brethren. The fruit of this Conference he embodied in his *"Consensus Tigurinus,"* or *"Zürich Agreement,"* which on the 1st of August he sent for signature to Bullinger and his associates. On the 30th they returned it with their signatures, *in token of the harmony of both branches of the Swiss Reformed Church.* In the preface to this document—after referring to the "impudent and preposterous" charges of one whom he takes care not to name (Luther, to wit), who had represented the Swiss Reformers as "leaving nothing in the Eucharist beyond empty signs"—he says, that that writer refuted himself, since but a few sentences further on he admitted that "we openly confess that the body of Christ is truly conveyed to the faithful in the Holy

Supper." "What?" (he asks). "When a true communication is asserted, is there nothing left beyond a naked and empty sign?" But it may be said, This is Calvin; but what of Zwingli? Well, you shall hear it. Calvin, in the document referred to, first says that in the early stages of this dispute it could not be expected that the whole subject should be at once expiscated, but that, since all "Sacramentarians" (as they were contemptuously styled) thought and spoke substantially alike, it was unfair to hold up minor discrepancies in the mode of conceiving and expressing their common views. He then uses these remarkable words: "Nor would those admirable and illustrious men, Zwingli and Œcolampadius, if they were alive at this day, change so much as one little word in that judgment" [of the Reformed].*

But, it may be asked, did the Zürichers accept this statement of Calvin's as an exposition of their own faith, as taught by Zwingli and Œcolampadius, and recognize its entire accordance with their own views? Let any one read the letter which they wrote to Calvin in returning the "Consensus" with their signatures, and he will have his own answer to that question. After warmly thanking him for the pains he had taken to show and express in writing their entire harmony, they inform him that they had sent his "Consensus" to some brethren skilled in divine things, who not only recognized their harmony in those points on which many thought they differed, but rendered thanks to Christ the Saviour for the promise of more abundant fruit in the Church which would flow from this harmony in God and the truth. Some, they say, desired a fuller exposition, going

* Nec vero, si superstites hodie essent optimi et eximii Christi servi, Zwinglius et Œcolampadius, verbum in ea sententia mutarent.

into all matters regarding the sacraments ; but what would be the use of dwelling on those things *about which there was not a shadow of difference*, as their own books and those of their departed and reverend teachers sufficiently showed? But of the corporeal presence of Christ the Lord, of the true intent of the solemn words, of *the eating of the body of Christ*, of the design, use, and effect of the sacraments (*on which heads many thought that their opinions, or at least their words, differed*), we have spoken so fully, plainly, and simply, that we hope that men desirous of brotherly concord and perspicuous truth will not think our publication [the "Consensus"] wanting in fulness and clearness of expression. Nor do we doubt that the ministers of Christ throughout Switzerland will easily perceive that we have here expressed that very doctrine on the sacraments which has these many years been proclaimed to the Christian people.

One would think that this ought to put an end to the cry that Zwingli and Calvin held different and discrepant views of the nature and design of the Lord's Supper ; but it seems not. In the most recent statement which I have seen on this point—by one whose acquaintance with the whole literature of the subject and sound judgment well entitles him to be heard—the real and almost vital difference between the Eucharistic views of Zwingli and Calvin is argued pretty keenly. I refer to an article in the "British Quarterly Review" for October, 1880, by the Rev. Alfred Cave, entitled, "The Lord's Supper Historically Considered," in a review of two English and three German works on the Lord's Supper. This acute writer lays down the indisputable principle, that to judge correctly of extracts from a book we must know the writer's object, his surroundings, and his point of view ; in particular, on a subject like this, he must have a fair acquaintance with its history at large, and the

precise position in which the question stood in his author's time. It would have been well if Mr. Cave had carried out his own principle in judging of this case, but we fail to see it. In dealing with Dr. Herbert, whose learned work stands at the head of his article,* he remarks with some severity on "the absence of the historical sense" displayed in that work, in his having given a string of quotations from Calvin's works, selected with a manifest bias, to show that Calvin held substantially with the Lutherans in opposition to Zwingli, while the reverse is proved (he says) by a passage in that same chapter of the "Institutes" from which Dr. Herbert quotes, which passage Mr. Cave translates for the benefit of his readers. It is no part of my business to justify Dr. Herbert's remarks on Calvin for which Mr. Cave blames him. They are contradicted, I think, by all the facts of Calvin's character and procedure. But Mr. Cave is no more entitled to defend Calvin from the charge of Lutheranism than to condemn Zwingli as an anti-Calvinist on the subject of the Eucharist. Mr. Cave may quote a dozen passages from Zwingli, proving how much lower than Calvin's were his views of the Lord's Supper; but is he prepared to say that he knows Calvin's views better than himself, and Zwingli's views better than all his representatives in German Switzerland, whose unanimous testimony—after the question was sifted to the bottom—was, that there was not a particle of difference between them?

Some, to show that Zwingli's views must have differed from Calvin's, refer to the following passage in the "Scottish Confession of 1560," condemning in the strongest terms what they think certainly pointed to

* "The Lord's Supper: History of Uninspired Teachings, from Clement of Rome to Canon Liddon." By Charles Herbert, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 1879.

Zwinglianism. "We utterlie dampne y^e vanitie of those that affirme Sacramentis to be nothing else but naked and bair signes." * Their argument is this: If Knox and Calvin were at one on this subject, as we know they were, and if Knox here disowns Zwingli's views, must not Calvin have done the same? To which the simple answer is, Since Calvin identifies his own views with Zwingli's, Knox, who agreed with Calvin, cannot have pointed to the views of Zwingli here. Beyond doubt, this passage in the "Scottish Confession" refers to those who "impudently and preposterously" *charged* the Zwinglians with this error.

To refer again for a moment to the keen and not very savoury debate at the Marburg Conference, 1529, about the meaning of "eating Christ's flesh" (in John vi., in relation to the Lord's Supper). If the Swiss believed that there was *no eating at all* in it, why didn't Luther cut the matter short in this way:—Gentlemen, it's no use arguing with you as to what *kind* of eating is meant here, for I see you don't believe there is in it any eating at all? But throughout all that protracted discussion nothing of the kind was alleged, and therefore no such thing was really imagined.

But those who pay small heed to anything coming from non-Anglican sources may pay some deference to their own "judicious Hooker," writing thus: "This was it that some did exceedingly fear, that Zwinglius and Ecolampadius would bring to pass that men should account of this sacrament but only as of a shadow,

* "Confession of y^e Fayht and Doctrin beleved and professed by y^e Protestantes of the Realme of Scotland exhibited to y^e Estates of y^e sam in Parliament and by thare publict votes authorised as a doctrin grounded upon the infallible wourd of God. Edin. 1561." Works of John Knox, Edited for the Woodrow Society by David Lang. Vol. ii., p. 114. 1848.

destitute, empty, void of Christ. Rut seeing that by opening the several opinions which have been held, they have grown, for aught I can see, on all sides to be at length to a general agreement concerning that which is alone material, namely, *the real participation of Christ, and of life in His body and blood by this sacrament*, wherefore should the world continue so distracted and rent with so manifold divisions, when there remaineth no more controversy, saving only about the subject where Christ is. . . . *It seemeth, therefore, much amiss that against them whom they term "Sacramentaries" [the Zwinglians] so many invective discourses are made, all running upon two points—that the Eucharist is not a bare sign or figure only, and that the efficacy of His body and blood is not all we receive in this sacrament. For no man having read their books and writings, which are thus traduced, can be ignorant that both these assertions they confess to be most true.* They grant that these holy mysteries, received in due manner, do instrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that body and blood which were given for the life of the world."*

I conclude with the following remarks :—

* Eccl. Pol., v. 67.—Even *Dorner*, in his "History of Protestant Theology"—though he allows his Lutheranism unduly (as I think) to influence his judgment when comparing Zwingli with Luther and Calvin—makes such admissions in his historical statement as amount to a virtual agreement with Hooker as to their substantial oneness. That he should join with those who allege that latterly Zwingli changed his views for the better, is what we scarcely expected from so penetrating a reader of history as Dorner; for the contrary may be proved from his latest production on this subject. But this is only what Dr. Cunningham had done before him. (See *Dorner's* "Geschichte d. Protest. Theol.," 228, etc., or Robson's "Translation," vol. i. p. 306, etc., and *Cunningham's* "The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation,"—"Zwingli and the Doctrine of the Sacraments," p. 212, etc.)

First. The natural tendency to express by the sign the thing signified—which led first to the confounding, and next to the identifying, of the one with the other—is curiously illustrated by the wavering and contradictory statements of the fathers, and even of the same father in his different writings, on this subject, as Dr. Herbert, in his book already referred to, abundantly shows. And when to this we add the tendency of unspiritual minds to *externalize* whatever is most spiritual in Divine truth, we have the secret of much that is untenable as well as of what is extravagant and incredible in the literature of this subject.

Second. Definite apprehensions and accurate phraseology in the expression of Divine truth are usually the fruit, not so much of the simple study of Scripture itself, as of keen and continuous controversy with those who oppose it, forcing those to whom the truth is dear into clearer views and more correct and unambiguous phraseology than they had reached before. Hence it will be found that the soundest fathers have at times been betrayed into statements bordering on heresy, if not actually heretical, on subjects which in their day had not been sifted to the bottom ; whereas *after* that period the same allowance could not justly be made for a repetition of such statements. Of this important principle I know no better illustration than in Bishop Bull's admirable reply to the learned Jesuit, Father Petau (Dionysius Petavius), in his elaborate and valuable work, "*De Dogmatibus Theologicis*." Petavius labours ingeniously to show that the doctrine of the Trinity was not held by the Ante-Nicæan fathers, and that to *the Church*, as represented in the Council of Nicæa, we are indebted for that vital doctrine. To make good this position he quotes passages from the ante-Nicæan fathers at variance, as he alleges, with this doctrine. To which Bishop Bull replies,

Such statements might indeed be justly chargeable with error *after* the Nicæan Council had so expressed the doctrine as to be free from all that is ambiguous and objectionable in the mode of expressing it, and had so formulated it as to carry the conviction of all who were sound in the faith, but not before that time. In proof of this he quotes passages from the same fathers to whom Petavius refers, which clearly imply the supreme Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, as well as of the Father. Whether the case of Cyril of Alexandria is one of these I scarcely remember ; but a better case could not be adduced. In his heat against Nestorius for asserting that in Christ there were two Persons as well as two natures—for which he was condemned by the Council of Ephesus—Cyril uses the expression *μία φύσις*, “one nature.” “Here,” Petavius ought to say, “is flat Eutychianism.” It is, no doubt ; but as Eutyches had not *till long after that* troubled the Church with his heresy of “one nature in Christ,” no one dreams of charging Cyril with Eutychianism. Well, now, only deal out the same justice to Zwingli, and his perfect consistency with even the richest views of the Lord’s Supper to be found in the Reformed Confessions will be seen and owned.

DAVID BROWN, D.D.

VI.

IN the Catholic view of the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, the central fact of Christianity, that the man Christ Jesus is the *one Mediator of God and man* (1 Tim. ii. 5), finds its highest recognition, and its most touching realization. For, as the Holy Eucharist is in the Catholic Church both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice, in the one it is the chief organ of that supernatural life, which God through Jesus Christ communicates to man ; while in the other it is the sublimest and most comprehensive act of worship which man, through the same Jesus Christ, can offer to God.

From which we may learn in a general way the twofold design of the institution, and the benefit which it is meant to convey to the individual and to the Church. To arrive at more definite notions on the subject we shall have to consider it separately under each of the two aspects which it presents. In doing so, however, it is important at the very outset to observe, that the Catholic view, ever intently fixed on the dignity of our Lord's person, involves an act of Omnipotence on His part, and the consequent admission on ours of His Divinity ; so that, in an exposition of it addressed to Christian readers, the Catholic advocate may take for granted the necessary postulate that Jesus Christ is true God as well as man. Where this principle is not fully recognized and kept in view the Last Supper loses all its religious significance. From ignoring it, M. De Pressensé fails to rise to the dignity of his theme ; by denying it, Mr. Page Hopps

brings it down to the level of a sentimental entertainment, where a man of finer temperament takes an affectionate farewell of friends, who by nature are his equals and by accident his inferiors.

I. THE SACRAMENT. As a Sacrament, the Eucharist is the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, together with His soul and Divinity, under the species of bread and wine. It involves, therefore, the two dogmas of the Real Presence and of Transubstantiation. On which points the Council of Trent, in its *Decree concerning the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist*, sets forth "that sound and genuine doctrine which the Catholic Church, instructed by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and by His Apostles, and taught by the Holy Ghost, who day by day brings to her mind all truth, has always retained and will preserve even to the end of the world." Accordingly, with reference to the Real Presence, it says, "The holy Synod teaches and openly and simply professes that, in the august Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things" ("Canons and Decrees of the Sac. and Ecumen. Council of Trent, translated by Rev. J. Waterworth, Sess. xiii. chap. i."). And with regard to Transubstantiation—"Because that Christ our Redeemer declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God ; and this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood : which conversion is by

the holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called Transubstantiation" (*Ibid.*, chap. iv.)

In the acknowledged absence of any Eucharistic passage of Scripture plainly excluding the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, the main obstacle in our day to the frank acceptance of the literal meaning of Christ's simple words, *this is My body, this is My blood*, lies, I conceive, in a latent dread of being brought face to face too palpably with the supernatural, associated with a suspicion that the foundations of faith are hardly strong enough to bear the strain of those difficulties which reason in this case brings to bear upon them. How awful the powers lodged by implication in the hands of the consecrating priest! and how manifold the objections conjured up by self-sufficient reason against the obvious meaning of Christ's words! Such considerations do not affect the Catholic. His faith in this, as well as in other doctrines of Revelation, is based not upon his own fallible interpretation of Holy Writ, but upon the infallible authority of the Church, without which, as St. Augustine most logically argues, he could not put faith in the Gospel itself.* He knows that Christ's commission to the ministers, whom He appointed to do in all time coming what He Himself had done (1 Cor. xi. 24-27), is guarantee enough that, no matter how great the power required may be, His omnipotence and His veracity are pledged for the result; and after all, he finds fewer intellectual difficulties in the mystery of Transubstantiation than he encounters in the Incarnation or the Trinity. The constitution of matter and the

* "Ego vero evangelio non crederem nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas. . . . Ipse Evangelio, Catholicis prædicantibus, credidi. . . . Si ad evangelium te tenes, ego me ad eos teneam quibus præcipientibus evangelio credidi" (Cont. Ep. Manichæi).

nature of space, on which these difficulties turn, lie, in their ultimate analysis, beyond our intellectual range. We do know, however, that infinite power can so overcome the finite resistance of matter as to compress into one point, without the annihilation of a single part, the whole of this material universe ; and, without adding one grain of corn to the mass, can so multiply five loaves of bread as to satiate the hunger of 5,000 men, with twelve baskets of fragments to the good. What, then, may we not expect from infinite power manipulating a body now glorified and placed in a sphere above mechanical laws, and capable of being divested of actual extension, that its presence may resemble that of a spirit? A word of warning from a Protestant divine may not be out of place. "While arguing upon this subject, or incidentally mentioning it, some persons, I regret to say, have been too copious in the use of those unseemly words 'absurdity and impossibility.' To such language the least objection is its reprehensible want of good manners. A much more serious objection is the tone of presumptuous loftiness which pervades it, and is wholly unbecoming a creature of very narrow faculties. Certainly God *will* do nothing absurd, and *can* do nothing impossible ; but it does not therefore follow that our view of things should be always perfectly correct and free from misapprehension. Contradictions we can easily *fancy*, where, in truth, there are none. Hence, therefore, before we consider any doctrine a contradiction we must be sure we perfectly understand the nature of the matter propounded in that doctrine ; for otherwise the contradiction may not be *in the matter itself*, but *in our mode of conceiving it*. In regard of myself,—as my consciously finite intellect claims not to be a universal measure of congruities and possibilities,—I deem it to be more wise and more decorous to refrain from assailing the doctrine of Transubstantiation, on the

grounds of its alleged absurdity, or contradictoriness, or impossibility. By such a mode of attack we, in reality, quit the field of rational and satisfactory argumentation.

"The doctrine of Transubstantiation, like the doctrine of the Trinity, is a question not of abstract reasoning, but of pure *evidence*. We believe the Revelation of God to be essential and unerring truth. Our business most plainly is not to discuss the abstract absurdity and the imagined contradictoriness of Transubstantiation, but to inquire, according to the best means we possess, whether it be, indeed, a doctrine of Holy Scripture. If sufficient evidence shall determine such to be the case, we may be sure that the doctrine is neither absurd nor contradictory. I shall ever contend that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, like the doctrine of the Trinity, is a question of pure evidence" (Faber, "Difficulties of Romanism." London, 1826, p. 54).

Dismissing, then, as every rational man must do, the difficulties springing in this question from the essential narrowness of our faculties, we may safely proceed to inquire, Whether there be any positive evidence for the Catholic view? In pursuing which investigation the Catholic finds himself much better equipped than the most favoured of his Protestant rivals. For not only has he, like the Protestant, the Scriptures and all the learning of commentators, together with his own resources to fall back upon, but he can claim exclusively for his own the faith of all Christian antiquity, and the living voice of the Church, interpreting for him unerringly the oracles of the one, and guiding him in his researches through the other. In this particular question of the Eucharist the testimony of the Fathers, and of all the liturgies, from the second century down to the Reformation, is so overwhelmingly in our favour that we need not refer further to them. It will be

enough to show, with due regard to brevity, how clearly Scripture establishes the Real Presence against Calvin, and Transubstantiation against Luther.

1. *Scriptural grounds for the Real Presence.*—"When we ask," says Dr. Brown in the preceding paper, "what is meant by the 'real presence' of Christ in the Supper, we get no intelligible answer. It will not do to say, as is continually done, 'We pretend not to explain *how* Christ is substantially present in the Eucharist; enough for us to believe the *fact*.' For what we ask you to explain is, not the *manner* of Christ's presence, but what you mean and understand by the *fact* of that presence; and you cannot tell us." Yet the Council of Trent told it plainly enough long ago, when it defined the Catholic doctrine on the subject against those who denied it: "If any one denieth, that, in the Sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but saith that he is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or virtue; let him be anathema" (Sess. XIII. can. i.) The presence in question is defined to be *true* in opposition to the *sign* of the Sacramentarians, *real* in opposition to their *figure*, and *substantial* in opposition to the emanation of *virtue* from Christ's body in heaven. It is hard to see how the *fact* of the real presence could be more intelligibly laid down, or more clearly expressed. I am afraid that, notwithstanding his disclaimer, Dr. Brown confounds partially together the *how* and the *what*. For in illustration of his difficulty he appeals to such expressions of his opponents as a presence, "strictly speaking, neither physical nor spiritual, but hyper-physical." Now, such terms are not used to signify the *fact*, but to explain the *manner* of the real presence already taken for granted.

To this reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist both Testaments bear witness: the Old in its types, the New in the history of the Promise, the Institution, and Administration of the Sacrament.

(1) *The Types*.—In arguing from the Old Testament to the New, St. Paul speaks of the elder appointments as mere *shadows* of the good things to come (Heb. viii. 5; ix. 23; Col. ii. 17). In the Church are to be found the realities foreshadowed in the figures of the Synagogue. The type, occurring in the visible order of nature, may have been an incident captivating the imagination by the dazzling splendour of its miracle; but, nevertheless, it was vastly inferior to the quiet, unobtrusive antitype that was to fulfil it in the supernatural order. The brazen serpent set up in the desert was a type of Christ upon the cross. A look at the one was followed by an instantaneous recovery from the bite of the fiery serpent. It was a stupendous miracle speaking to the eye and experience of every one in the camp of Israel. By a look at the other, in due disposition of faith, we recover from the bite of the infernal serpent. It is a change, unnoted perhaps by any human eye, but in the supernatural order far transcending the miraculous agency of the figure.

As this principle pervades all the typical arrangements of the Old Testament, it is easy to see that mere bread cannot be prefigured by bread, much less by the more highly organized flesh of animals, and perhaps least of all by the manna, which seems to have no counterpart in the natural productions of earth.

Now what are the Old Testament figures of the Eucharist? Passing over the bread and wine of Melchisedech, the shew-bread (properly, *bread of the presence*), the bread that supported Elias forty days until he came to the vision of Jehovah, we may touch upon three.

That the Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ all admit; and that the Paschal Supper prefigured the Eucharistic meal can be denied least of all by those who see no sacrificial rite in the ordinance. Indeed, the institution of the Eucharist in immediate sequence to the eating of the Passover sufficiently indicates that the new rite was intended to supersede the old, as its legitimate fulfilment (1 Cor. v. 7). Can the eating of a morsel of bread, even with faith in Christ, be the fulfilment of the Paschal meal? In the scale of being the animal organization of the lamb places it in a higher category than the bread; and the flesh of the animal drained of its blood, as it lies slain upon the table, is a far more significant image of Christ's death than bread can ever be. So that both ontologically and symbolically the vegetable is inferior to the animal, and can in no wise be the reality of which the animal is the figure. Even should we admit that the bread was not meant to represent the Lamb directly, but the body of Christ, it would still be inexplicable how a mere figure should be so marked a feature in the system whence figures had passed away, and that it should be even inferior in stamp to those for which it was substituted. The Eucharistic bread, therefore, to entitle it to be the reality foreshadowed in the Paschal Lamb, must have been something vastly superior to the latter. Christ tells us that it is *His flesh*.

The words of our Lord at the Last Supper show that He meant the *blood of the Covenant*, which Moses sprinkled on the people at the time the Old Covenant was ratified (Exod. xxiv. 8), to be a figure of *His blood of the New Testament* which was at that moment shed mystically in the chalice *for many for the remission of sins*. In the figure the blood of the victim was sprinkled externally on the people, or, at the Passover, on the door-posts of the house where they were assembled. But in the fulfil-

ment the blood of the Redeemer was to penetrate the inmost recesses of our being; and hence was given to the Apostles to drink. The blood of the lamb or the ox was a better image of Christ's blood than wine could be. So that, unless the Eucharistic wine was what our Lord said it was, that is, *His very blood*, the reality once more falls below the figure.

Another type of the Eucharist was the manna (John vi. 32; 1 Cor. x. 3), which was far superior to ordinary bread, made by the hands of angels (Psalm lxxvii. 25), and having a sweetness for every palate (Wis. xvi. 20, 21). It was a figure, not of a figure, but of the real body of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist.

(2) *The Promise*.—What had been prefigured in the Old Testament was worthy of being promised in the New, even before the Institution showed how the promise was to be fulfilled. They who think otherwise will find a sufficient answer in the words of Sherlock: "The only objection I know against expounding this (John vi.), of eating the flesh of Christ, and drinking His blood in the Lord's Supper, is because the feast was not yet instituted, and therefore neither the Jews nor His own disciples could possibly understand what He meant. Now there are several answers to this: as—

"Our Saviour said a great many things to the Jews in His sermons which neither they nor His own disciples could understand when they were spoken, though His disciples understood them after He was risen. . . . Suppose one should understand this eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man, of feeding on Christ by faith, or believing; yet they could understand this no better than the other. It is plain they did not, and I know not how they should. For to call our believing in Christ eating His flesh and drinking His blood is so remote from all propriety of speaking, and so unknown in all

languages, that to this day those who understand nothing more by it but believing in Christ are able to give no tolerable account of the expression" ("Pract. Dis. on Religious Assemblies." Lond., 1700, pp. 364-367).

The passages spoken of in the above citation are found in the sixth chapter of St. John. He is the only one of the evangelists who omits the remarkable history of the institution of the Sacrament. But there was the less need for repeating what the other evangelists had already explained, as he dedicates the whole of chap. vi. to a detailed account of what took place on the memorable occasion when He formally promised to institute it. In that chapter we can distinguish three parts—the preparation, the approach, and the actual treatment of the subject.

The preparation extends from ver. 1 to ver. 25. The first fifteen verses are taken up with an account of our Lord's miraculous multiplication of the bread to feed the vast multitude that had come to hear Him. In that action He exhibited His unlimited control over the powers of nature in such a way, that a believer in Him could find no difficulty in admitting that He could as easily multiply the bread of life which He was going to give them, and that, when all had had their fill, there would still remain what, multiplied in His Divine hands, would amply suffice for every one till the end of time. That He might strengthen still more the belief of those who had seen the miracle, and had thereupon taken Him for the long-expected prophet, and that He might the better arm them against the scandal which He knew His words would cause, He works two other great miracles in the sight of the apostles, one of which, at least, He took care should come to the knowledge of the multitude (ver. 25).

The approach to the subject is occasioned by the people

themselves, who, being thus predisposed to trust implicitly in Him, again flock around Him, and, in wonder at His evidently miraculous passage from the other side of the lake, question Him about it : *Rabbi, when camest Thou hither?* (ver. 25). In order to bring on the subject which He had at heart, instead of answering directly, He gently rebukes them for their solicitude in seeking after such perishable food as He had supplied them with the day before, while that which endureth unto life everlasting gave them little or no concern. He will have them reverse that order, and subordinate the temporal to the eternal : *Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man will give you* (ver. 27). Here we can see unmistakably that the *labour* required is quite different from the *meat* to be given. The labour on their part is the *condition* on which He promises on His to grant the meat, as the *conditionate*. What, then, is the labour demanded from them that they may obtain the meat promised by Him? This is the question they now put to Him, knowing well, of course, that the labour must be some work pleasing to God : *What shall we do, that we may work the works of God?* (ver. 28). The labour, He answers, is to believe in Him : *This is the work of God, that you believe in Him whom He hath sent* (ver. 29). Thoroughly understanding what He required of them, and inflamed with the desire of possessing the wondrous food that had in it the potency of life eternal, they earnestly entreat Him to furnish them with a conclusive sign, that it was *He whom the Father had sealed*. *What sign, then, dost Thou show that we may see, and may believe Thee? What dost thou work?* (ver. 30). The very ancient book, called *Midrash kohemoth*, lets us know that, in early ages, the Jews, accustomed as they were to see in Moses—the first goel or liberator—a manifold

type of their second Goel, the Messiah, expected from the latter, when He should come, a miracle analogous to that of the manna, but as much surpassing it as the Messiah surpassed His prototype.* That idea seems to have been uppermost in the thoughts of the Jews on the present occasion. Associating, therefore, this expectation with the miraculous bread of the preceding day, and with the still more miraculous food now promised by Jesus Christ, they appeal to the fulfilment of His promise as the conclusive sign that will mark Him out infallibly as their great prophet and Messiah: *Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written: He gave them bread from heaven to eat* (ver. 31). Reminding them that it was not Moses, properly speaking, but the Father, who had given the manna, He tells them that the Father is now ready to give them from heaven that true bread of which they were thinking, and of which the manna was but a shadow: *Amen, amen, I say to you, Moses gave you not bread from heaven; but My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world* (vers. 32, 33). This, they felt assured, was the very meat for which He required them to labour, and which, if He were the Messiah, He would give them. Let Him but give them such bread, and they would believe in Him: *Lord, give us always this bread* (ver. 34). Here their carnal leanings made them reverse the true order of things. Christ had promised to give them what they prayed for, but on the condition that they would first believe in Him: they wish first to have the bread, and then faith in Him would follow. Our Lord, therefore,

* See Schoettgen, "*Horsæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*," in Jo. v. 35; Lightfoot, "*Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations*," in *loc.*; Card. Wiseman, "*The Real Presence*," etc., Lond., Dolman, 1861; *Lecture I*, p. 39.

brings them back to what He had started with in vers. 27, 29, that faith in Him must go before, and the bread come after. For He Himself was that bread, and no one could receive Him as such without first believing in Him : *I am the bread of life: he that cometh to Me* (condition) *shall not hunger* (conditionate) ; *and he that believeth in Me* (condition) *shall never thirst* (conditionate) (ver. 35).

He therefore now explains the need and the nature of that faith required, as the preliminary condition, for receiving Him as the *bread of life* (vers. 35-47). The Jews, not yet clearly understanding what He meant by calling Himself the bread of life, take Him sharply up on the point they understood, and murmured at Him, because He had said : *I am the living bread which came down from heaven. And they said: Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then saith He, I came down from heaven?* (vers. 41, 42). On account of this demonstration of incredulity, He insists all the more on the necessity of believing in Him, in order to secure eternal life (vers. 43-47), and then winds up this whole exposition of faith by reverting to the proposition with which He set out in ver. 35 : *I am the bread of life* (ver. 48).

This, then, is the subject to which the preceding miracles and dialogue lead up. In resuming it our Lord now expatiates upon it, and evolves it from ver. 48 to ver. 59, no more returning to faith, the need for which He had already amply expounded.

The bread is Christ Himself (vers. 35, 48) ; His flesh (ver. 52), not His doctrine. That He and His flesh may serve as nourishment, He has to transform Himself into the shape of food ; and so His flesh becomes *meat indeed*, and His blood *drink indeed*. In this state He (ver. 58) and His flesh are to be eaten (vers. 54-57), and His

blood is to be drunk. Hence it follows that if *to eat Christ* means *to believe in Him, to eat His flesh and drink His blood* must signify *to believe in His flesh and blood*. That was no hard matter (ver. 61) to those who believed Him to be no more than man. Yet the doctrine here taught was something so superlatively unpalatable not only to the Jews (ver. 53), but to many who up to this time had believed in Him, that the former *strove among themselves*, and the latter abandoned Him in numbers (vers. 61, 67). Surely they were no mean judges of what He meant to convey to their minds. And it would have been a strange way for Divine wisdom to insinuate the necessity of belief in Him under figures of speech so repulsive to the Jew, as that of eating human flesh and drinking human blood. When we add, that the bread here promised was to be given at some future time (vers. 27, 52), whereas His faith and doctrine He was actually tendering to the Jews at that moment, as He had been doing for the last two years and a half, the *eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood* must be that which takes place in the Eucharist. For between faith and the Eucharist there is in this chapter no alternative.

One objection made to this conclusion by Waterland and Beveridge it may be well to notice, before passing to the question whether Christ's flesh and blood in the Eucharist are to be taken orally, or only spiritually by faith. The universality of such expressions, *if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; he that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath everlasting life*, etc., shows, according to them, that it cannot be question of "*Sacramental feeding*" in the Eucharist. For it is not true, that all who receive the communion have life, unless we put in the restriction of *worthy* and *so far*. Much less can it be true, that all who never have, or never shall receive, have not life, unless we make several

restrictions. Now, an interpretation which must be clogged with a multitude of restrictions to make it bear, if at all, is such as one would not choose (other circumstances being equal) in preference to what is clogged with *fewer* or with *none*" (Card. Wiseman, "The Real Presence," etc., Lect. IV. p. 133).

This objection arises from a total forgetfulness of the relation that food has to the recipient. It is not given to a corpse, but to a living man. A physiologist, in describing the use of bread and descanting on its life-giving properties, never thinks of adding, what is understood of itself, that his remarks apply only to the living subject, and that so far their universality must be restricted. The *bread of life* is to be given to those only who are already numbered in the category of the living, not, of course, to impart the first breath of life, but to preserve, and nourish, and increase the vitality that exists, and to develop it into life everlasting. It is this vitality that constitutes the worthiness of the receiver. So that, in the very nature of things, the worthiness is pre-supposed. For the same reason it is evident that, when it is said of the non-recipient that he shall not have life, it means that he shall lose the life which he already has. Disobedience to the Divine precept of eating this bread is of itself enough to bring about this result. For it is a grievous sin, which of itself deprives the soul of its supernatural life.

It need not be added that *faith* also, were it even to pass for the *living bread*, would need to be clogged with the same restrictions. For to have its due effect it must be a faith, *true* and *sincere*, that *worketh by love*.

Let us now see whether Christ meant His flesh and blood to be taken by *the mouth corporeally*, or *spiritually by faith*. To settle this point we should try to find out

what He intended His words to convey to the minds of the Jews and His disciples. That we shall ascertain to a certainty, if we can make out these four things: what was the force of His words according to the usage of the language in which He spoke; how the Jews actually understood them; how His own disciples understood them; and whether our Lord, knowing the impression made, corrected or confirmed it.

First, What was the force of His words in the language of His day? *To eat one's flesh* is an expression which in various forms is met with in the Old Testament and in the New; and the frequency of its occurrence makes it easy to come at the ordinary meaning of the words. In general it is used metaphorically, and then signifies *to do one grievous injury chiefly by calumnious accusation*. (See Psalm xxvii. 2; Eccles. iv. 5; Job xix. 22; Micah iii. 3; Jer. xix. 9; James v. 3; Gal. v. 15.)

The Arabs employ the same metaphor in the same meaning, many examples of which may be seen in Card. Wiseman's "Lectures on the Real Presence," Lect. II. In Syriac, a dialect of which was spoken in Palestine in the days of our Lord, there is scarcely any other way of expressing the idea of calumnious accusation; so much so that the Greek name *διάβολος*, *slanderer*, standing for the devil, is always translated in the Peschito version of the New Testament **ܐܚܠܟܪܝܝܐ** *ochelkarzo*, *the eater of a piece of flesh*.

Such being the metaphorical meaning of *eating one's flesh* in the ordinary language of those whom Christ was addressing, in that sense must be the phrase taken, if we are to stand by the figure, for there is no other metaphorical meaning which it can bear. It is most justly remarked by Card. Wiseman in treating this subject: "There is no style of language in which we are left less at liberty in attaching signification to phrases, than in

employing metaphorical terms which are in daily use. Take for instance the word *lion*. So long as by it we describe objects which fall under the senses, we apply it to things of very different forms ; the animal of that name, or its Egyptian, Chinese, or heraldic representative, though differing equally from their prototype, and from one another, all these are equally called by the same name. But when you come to the figure, and say that "Such a man is a lion," you have no choice of meaning ; and though the lion might be justly distinguished for his agility, his lofty gait, his generous disposition, and his noble instincts, yet would no one ever understand the figure of any of these ; but only of that overpowering strength, joined to unyielding courage, of which he is the emblem. And if, in like manner, I said of a warrior chief that he was a *tiger*, nobody would ever understand me, if thereby I intended to describe his strong limbs, or his soft gait, or his amazing power of leaping and running. For, although these are all qualities of that animal, usage has attached an invariable meaning to the metaphor, which we all understand at once, and from which no one who wishes to be understood may lawfully depart. The same must be said of all established figurative phrases ; besides their literal significations, they can only bear that metaphorical one which use has given them " (*Ibid.*, Lect. II., pp. 63, 64).

Now the metaphorical meaning of the phrase in question could not for a moment have been intended by Christ ; and as there is no alternative between that and the literal meaning of *eating and drinking orally His flesh and blood*, in this literal sense we are compelled to take it.

Secondly, The Jews took him up in that way. For it is the literal acceptation of His words that gives origin to that incredulous striving with one another : *how can this man give us His flesh to eat?* (ver. 53).

Thirdly, His very disciples, familiar with His style of speech, understood Him precisely in the same manner : *This saying is hard, and who can hear it?* If they understood Him to urge on His followers the need of believing in Him and receiving Him in faith, there was nothing more than ordinary to offend them. Such was the demand which all along He had been making on His disciples. There was, therefore, in this hypothesis, no reason whatever for renouncing their allegiance to Him. This, however, they actually did, even after He had spoken such words as were calculated, had they misunderstood Him, to take the edge off their misinterpretation (vers. 64-67).

Fourthly, That their impression, as well as that of the Jews, was the right one so far as the literal meaning is concerned, is made abundantly clear by the implied testimony of Christ Himself that He was understood. *Doth this scandalize you?* (ver. 61). The demonstrative points, not to the sound of the words, nor directly to the meaning which He had in his mind different from theirs, but to the meaning which they attached to the words. The meaning on His side coincided with theirs as far as the literal sense was concerned, otherwise He would have cleared up their mistake. Again, He says, *There are some of you that believe not* (ver. 64). What? His words as they presented themselves to their minds. For He has no further explanation to offer, and no one can be reproached for disbelieving a doctrine, the very terms of which he does not understand.

It will put our conclusion in a still clearer light if we compare Christ's conduct on the present occasion with what He said and did at other times when He was understood or misunderstood by His audience. We find, then, that if He happens to be taken literally when He spoke figuratively, He invariably corrects the mistake

(Matt. xvi. 6-12 ; John iv. 32-34 ; xi. 11-14). The case of Nicodemus is very instructive (John iii.) To him Christ says, *Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.* Nicodemus takes Him up literally, and asks, *How can a man be born when he is old?* as the Jews asked, *How can this man give us His flesh to eat?* To Nicodemus He replies, correcting his mistake, and showing that He was speaking of a *spiritual* birth. Nicodemus is satisfied, and becomes His disciple. To the Jews of Capharnaum, speaking to the impression actually on their minds, Christ answers by asseverating repeatedly and enforcing emphatically the truth of what He had said ; and so far from offering any more intelligible explanation of His words, He resorts to what would have been in case of misapprehension a thoroughly misleading device. For He distinguishes five times His flesh from His blood, and affirms most solemnly the need of eating His flesh and drinking His blood. The Jews could not help feeling that He wished His words to be taken literally. The result, foreseen, of course, by Jesus Christ, was the hardened incredulity of some, and the open apostasy of many who up to that crisis had believed in Him. One simple word would have explained all. It never came. Even the very twelve He will allow to go, rather than soften one single feature of a doctrine which appeared to many of His former disciples so harsh and revolting. Peter went at once to the root of the matter, and spoke for every Catholic, when he exclaimed, *Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life* (ver. 69).

Such precisely is the line which Christ follows on other occasions, when His words are taken literally, as He meant them to be, and when some objection is founded thereon. He says to the paralytic, *Thy sins are forgiven thee* (Matt. ix. 2). He is understood literally as

claiming the actual power of forgiving sins, and in consequence set down as a blasphemer. He answers by asserting plainly that He has the power, and He proves it by a miracle. In John viii. 56-58, the Jews rightly understood Him to claim an existence contemporaneous with Abraham. They demur to the possibility of such a thing. The answer is, *Before Abraham was, I am*. In the very discussion carried on in John vi., the Jews correctly take Him to assert that He came down from heaven (ver. 41), and murmur at the proposition. He accordingly repeats it, and enforces it (ver. 51). It is this same mode of procedure that He adopts in meeting the objection which the Jews based on the literal acceptance of His words, *How can this man give us His flesh to eat?* Instead of explaining away the seeming harshness of the expression, He repeats it, He enforces it, He emphasises it, He breaks it up into separate propositions, each of which He asserts to be true, and He expatiates upon it at length, prefacing the whole by that solemn "corroboration and confirmation of a saying," as the Jews call the *amen*, especially when doubled: *Amen, amen, I say to you* (vers. 54-59).

To all this we may add that John himself, when a saying of his Divine Master was in danger of being misunderstood, generally points out in what sense it was intended (ch. ii. 21; vii. 39; xi. 13). In our passage his silence is eloquent.

There is but one phrase in the whole course of this most interesting instruction of our Lord that has the least semblance of an explanation; and as some, on the strength of it, reject that literal meaning which we have been advocating, it may be well to give it a passing notice, especially as it will help us to arrive at a clearer conception of the whole bearing of the discourse. *It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the*

words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life (ver. 64). So runs the passage. Does it not show that Christ means His words to be taken figuratively, and not literally?

This passage is susceptible of various interpretations, every one of which is compatible with the literal meaning of *eating His flesh and drinking His blood*. The attempt to force upon it the exclusion of the literal meaning argues an utter ignorance of Scriptural phraseology. Wherever in Holy Writ the *flesh* and the *spirit* are contrasted, it is to indicate the two opposing principles of action which manifest themselves in man: the one in the *natural* man, who is actuated by human motive or passion, with no reference to higher principle; the other in the *spiritual* man, who, elevated by Divine grace, rises above this world. The former set of motives is styled compendiously *the flesh*, the latter *the spirit*. St. Paul copiously illustrates this in Rom. viii. 1-10: *There is therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not according to the flesh. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath delivered me from the law of sin and of death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and of sin, hath condemned sin in the flesh: that the justification of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit. For they that are according to the flesh mind the things that are of the flesh; but they that are according to the Spirit mind the things that are of the Spirit. For the wisdom of the flesh is death; but the wisdom of the Spirit is life and peace. Because the wisdom of the flesh is an enemy to God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither can it be. And they who are in the flesh cannot please God. But you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. Now if*

any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His. And if Christ be in you, the body indeed is dead because of sin; but the Spirit liveth because of justification. With such a passage before us, to which every other where the *flesh* and *spirit* are contrasted is conformable, we see that in the expression there is nothing that has the remotest connection with meanings literal or figurative. In such sense the *letter* may be opposed to the *spirit*, though the *spirit* then means the spiritual *reality* foreshadowed by the material *figure*. But the *flesh* never stands for the literal meaning. So here *the spirit* cannot be taken in the sense of *figure*. Much less can *the flesh* denote the flesh of Christ; for the *flesh* here spoken of *profiteth nothing*; the flesh of Christ redeemed the world.

Whatever particular shade of meaning, therefore, we may be inclined to give to ver. 64, it must be kept within the range of the *spiritual and supernatural*, as opposed to the *natural and carnal*. The words of Christ belong to the region of the former, and are not to be gauged by the measure of *the flesh*, as they were by the incredulous Jews.

Let us now see how the Promise was kept in—

(3) *The Institution*. St. John, having already narrated at large the history of the Promise, does no more than allude to its fulfilment in those remarkable words descriptive of Christ's undying love, manifested in what He said and did at the Last Supper: *having loved His own who were in the world, He loved them unto the end* (ch. xiii. 1). The other evangelists, passing over the Promise, confine themselves to a history of the Institution; and yet we find the correspondence of one with the other so perfect, as to make it clear that what John describes our Lord as promising is precisely the same thing as the others, along with St. Paul, describe Him

as executing (Matt. xxvi.; Mark xiv.; Luke xxii.; 1 Cor. xi. 23-26). He was to give them to eat that flesh of His, which was to be *given for the life of the world* (John vi. 52); He gave it when He said, *Take and eat; this is My body* (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22), *My body which is given for you* (Luke xxii. 19), *My body which is broken for you* (1 Cor. xi. 24). He was to give them His *blood to drink* (John vi. 54-56); He did so when He said, *Drink ye all of this; for this is My blood* (Matt. xxvi. 27, 28). He promised that at all times His flesh and blood should be presented as meat and drink, when He laid the obligation on the faithful of all times to receive them (John vi. 54-58); at the Institution He provided for this when He said, *This do for the commemoration of Me* (1 Cor. xi. 24); *This do ye, as often as ye shall drink, for the commemoration of Me. For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come* (ib. vers. 25, 26). These words imply that what He said and did at the Institution was to be said and done for all future ages by those whom He empowered to act in His name.

In the history of the Institution, therefore, of what every one calls the Eucharist, we find an additional reason for maintaining that in John vi. the Eucharist was the subject of discourse. Here, however, the question is much simpler than it was there. It is all reduced to this: Do the words, *This is My body, this is My blood*, mean, *This is My body, and this is My blood*, truly, really, and substantially? or, *This is My body, and this is My blood*, only in a sign, or in figure, or in virtue?

The words are so simple in themselves, and the assertion so unqualified, that, without an accumulation of terms, it is impossible to express more clearly the fact of the *Real Presence* under the sacramental species. To make them, against all the proprieties of speech, denote

the *real absence* of the body and blood, Scripture was ransacked for passages where the verb *to be* meant to *signify*, or *represent*; and, from a fancied parallelism between such passages and the words of institution, the inference was drawn that *to be* in the latter had the same signification as in the former.

It is the fact, however, that in Hebrew, from which some of the examples were taken, and in the cognate languages, one of which was most probably spoken by our Lord at the Last Supper, the verb *to be*, which is supposed to stand for *represent*, is in such cases never used at all. No doubt it is understood; but precisely for this very reason, that it *does not* signify to *represent*, but simply the fact of *being*, which fact must of necessity be understood where, in a proposition, there is no other verb to express the relation between the subject and the predicate.

Independently of that, it has been too hastily assumed that it can ever mean anything else than *existence* or *reality*. It is the *substantive* verb, whose very nature it is to express *being*. What kind of being the thing may have is to be learned elsewhere, either from the subject or from the predicate. In sentences its office is to express the union of these two extremes, and hence in logic it goes by the name of the *copula*. Whether the agreement affirmed is one of figure or reality depends altogether on the nature either of the subject or of the predicate.

The figure may be found in the nature of the subject when the mind sees in the latter some natural or conventional analogy that qualifies it to stand for a sign of something else. Walking through a gallery of historical busts and portraits, I require no one to tell me that the very nature of the objects around me is so associated with the idea of representation that it needs an effort to dis-

sociate the two. *That is Plato*, is my natural exclamation when I recognize his bust among the rest. The subject here is not the block of marble, but in my mind it is the man represented by the sculpture; so that the verb retains its own signification, and merely joins the subject and the predicate together.

It often happens too that the subject of a proposition undergoes in the mind some modification, which transfers it from its natural and material form to one that is immaterial and ideal; and with a subject so modified there is frequently coupled a predicate, which could not be attributed to it in its material state. When St. Paul says, *The rock was Christ*, by a mental process he transfers the material rock to a spiritual and mystic state, in which it agrees literally with the predicate, *Christ*. The sense, therefore, is *The spiritual rock was Christ*. That this is St. Paul's meaning is evident from the context itself: *They drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ*. The Rabbis, giving reins to their imagination, conceived that the rock struck by Moses literally followed the camp of Israel through the wilderness. Paul, well versed in Rabbinical lore, adroitly gives the tradition a figurative turn, to make it serve his own purpose. Some viewed the water gushing from the rock with merely carnal eyes; but others, more spiritual, saw therein prefigured the grace that was to *flow from the fountains of the Saviour*. These compared water with grace, and the rock with Christ. The material rock, therefore, *prefigured* Christ; but the mystic rock *was* Christ.

A similar explanation should be given of allegories, parables, prophetic visions or dreams, and symbolic actions, when transferred to the realities which they represent; for the mind to which they are presented knows that the speaker is actually expounding the

meaning of a symbol. *These are the two covenants* (Gal. iv. 24); *the field is the world* (Matt. xiii. 38); *the seven stars are the angels of the seven Churches* (Apoc. i. 20); *the seven good kine are seven years* (Gen. xli. 26). In such cases the subject is mentally transferred from a real to a symbolic state, and so is actually that which is predicated of it.

It is sometimes the predicate, however, that undergoes the transformation or modification. Two subjects are often coupled together, one of which is the subject of attribution, while the other stands for the predicate, such as *Christ was a lamb*. The patient gentleness characteristic of the lamb is the quality predicated; but instead of the abstract quality, we take the concrete subject, and figuratively say *lamb* instead of *lamblike*. The figure does not lie in the verb, but in the predicate. This applies to such expressions as *I am the Door*; *I am the Vine*, etc.

The question, then, which we have here to consider is, not whether the substantive verb in the words of Institution means *to represent*, but whether the subject or the predicate is of such a nature as to demand a symbolical acceptation. A little attention will show that, so far from *demanding*, they do not even *admit* such an acceptation.

There are some things whose very nature it is to be signs of other things, such as portraits and statues; and in these the *significative* element dominates so much over the *ontological*, that it requires something of a mental effort to think of the marble or the canvas rather than the representation. Natural analogy and conventional agreement furnish us with many other things which in discourse easily pass for signs. In such cases the mind leaves out of sight what the thing *is itself*, and considers only what it *signifies*. But there are many other things

which are spoken of as they are in themselves, and are not understood to be signs of anything else; and should any one, without forewarning his hearers, use such objects as signs, he would certainly be misunderstood. He might point to a bust and say, *That is Julius Cæsar*. Every one would take him up. But were he to take in his hand a piece of bread and say, *This is the patriarch Joseph*, without indicating any point of analogy, he would be set down as some crazy mountebank; for neither by nature nor by convention is bread a sign representative of man. Christ took bread into His hands and said, *This is My body*. Could the apostles to whom He spoke consider bread as a sign of His body? It was not so of its own nature; it was not so by any natural analogy; it was not so by general convention; it was not so by anything He had previously said or done; it was not made so by any word used by Him on the present occasion. A sign of His body, therefore, they could not understand it to be. The figure of speech then, if there be one, is not found in the *bread*.

After all, it is not *bread* that is the subject of the proposition, but the demonstrative pronoun, *this*. It is the office of the demonstrative to denote the presence, whether real or ideal, of the thing spoken of, but not to designate its nature and properties. Be the nature of the thing what it may, the demonstrative points out no more than the presence of the thing demonstrated. It may happen that at the close of a proposition the term of demonstration is different from what it was at the beginning: for propositions may be *practical* as well as *theoretical*, and when they are so they effect what they signify, while the theoretical merely announce what already exists. *This is wine*, is a *theoretical* proposition. The demonstrative *this* denotes what was wine at the beginning, and what is wine at the end of the proposition. But had Christ said

these words over the water, when He changed it into wine, the term of demonstration would have been different at the beginning and at the end of the proposition, viz., *water* at the beginning, but *wine* at the end. *This* does not mark the *nature* of the term, but only its *presence in confuso*. In the intention of the speaker it would have been directed to the water, that, at the announcement of the predicate, it should cease to be water, and make way for what the predicate affirmed it to be. Water, therefore, is the term of demonstration in *a state of transition*. But when in the predicate it is affirmed to be wine, and what is affirmed is actually brought about, the first term of demonstration ceases and becomes wine in *a state of permanence* (see Card. Franzelin, "Tract. de SS. Euch. Sac. et Sacrif." Romæ, 1868, pp. 65, 66).

In the same way the practical proposition, *this is My body*, must be explained. The pronoun *this* points to the presence in *confuso* of the thing contained under the phenomenal environment, to which the attention of the apostles was directed. That, before the enunciation of the predicate, was bread (*Jesus took bread*, etc.) But when, at the close of the proposition, it is affirmed in the predicate to be the body of Christ, it has ceased to be bread; for otherwise the proposition would be false. In the beginning of the proposition, therefore, the term of demonstration is bread in *a state of transition*; at the close, when the predicate affirms it to be not bread, but the body of Christ, it becomes the body of Christ in *a state of permanence* (see Franzelin, *ibid.* p. 66).

There is consequently nothing whatever in the *subject* of the proposition that gives the least indication of its employment as a mere sign of another thing. As little is such an indication to be found in the *predicate*, *My body*. Hence we see that the numerous texts cited from Scripture as parallel with the words of Institution are entirely

beside the mark. They are either misconceptions of the real bearing of the passages (Gen. xvii. 10; Exod. xii. 11), or they are understood by those to whom they are addressed to contain signs or symbols of other things. How is it then that Dr. Brown is so surprised "that the words *Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you*, should be understood literally"? Is it not rather surprising that he argues as if a piece of bread were as speaking and natural an image of man as a photograph, and fails to see that one need not be a fool, though he misses the points of resemblance?

Not only is there no indication of sign or figure in the subject or predicate, but there is in the words a force and emphasis that draws attention to their literal truth and reality. In Luke we have τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον; and in Mark τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον; which may be rendered, *This is My own body, that which is given for you; this is My own blood, that of the new covenant, that which is shed for many*. This emphasis, which has been remarked by Clarke, Horne, and other Protestant authors, would be strangely misplaced if it were meant to characterize only the shadow, and not the reality of the body and blood.

Moreover, all the circumstances in which the words were spoken tell in favour of the literal, against the figurative interpretation. For they are such as to require the plainest language; not to the exclusion indeed of figures of speech, which no one could misunderstand (such as the *cup* standing for what it contained), but of such as any prudent man, who wished to avoid ambiguities, would hesitate to employ. Our Lord was drawing up His last will and testament; He was introducing a new rite to be religiously observed in all future ages; He was instituting a sacrament of the new law, and giving

instructions as to how it should be administered; and He was solemnly ratifying His own new covenant with His people, as the old one had been ratified by Moses. In the old, Moses took the blood of the typical victims, and by touching them with it externally consecrated them to the service of a typical religion. In the new, Jesus Christ presents His own blood in fulfilment of the type, and by touching His disciples with it internally, consecrates them to the religion of *spirit and of truth*. In the former Moses said, הִנֵּה דָם הַבְרִיתָה, *Behold the blood of the covenant*, denoting the actual presence of the blood that was sprinkled; in the latter Christ, to mark the actual presence of His own blood, says, *This is My blood of the New Testament*. To fulfil the figure, the *real* blood of the *real* victim must have been in the chalice.

Everything, therefore, tends to show that such must have been the impression made upon the simple and untutored minds of the apostles. Paley, in his "Evidences of Christianity," admits that the Protestant explanation of the words "requires, to say the least, research and erudition to clear up" (Wiseman, *ibid.* p. 160). The apostles had little of either; and it would have needed far more than the world has yet seen to make them take their Master's simple words in a sense so inconsistent with all the laws of language. One thing they were sure of, that whatever He said He had power to do. They had seen Him, without a word spoken or sign given, change water into wine; they had seen Him with a mere blessing multiply bread a thousandfold; they had heard Him promise that one day He would give them His own flesh to eat and His own blood to drink, and when many of His disciples disbelieved in His ability to do so, and abandoned Him in disgust, they threw themselves on His Divinity, as the faith that made all things easy. Were they likely now, when in such memorable circum-

stances He fulfilled His promise, to take His words in a sense different from what they had done before, and think that it was not His body and His blood, though He said it was?

It is strange that Dr. Brown, with so many others, should find in *Do this in remembrance of Me* a refutation of the Catholic argument: "To remember one not present in his actual substantial form is intelligible enough; but to remember an actually present person is to me not intelligible." I have no doubt the objector is better than his argument would imply, and that, though the Creator is present, he remembers Him, as he is enjoined (Eccles. xii. 1). In the sacrament Jesus Christ is hidden from our view. It is His own revelation that He is there, and to recall that revelation is necessarily a matter of memory. This answer would be sufficient were it simply our Lord's person that we had to remember. But it is Jesus Christ dying upon the cross that we have to commemorate, in accordance with St. Paul's explanation, *As often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come* (1 Cor. xi. 26). That is an historical fact that needs memory to bring it back.

Another objection Dr. Brown founds on the word *broken*, used by our Lord in reference to His body. "It is not His 'body' simply, but His body as *broken for us*, that He would have us see in the bread. Now, is the death of Christ present at the table in any real, actual, material sense—in any intelligible sense, save spiritually, to the faith of the communicant?" Here the fact is overlooked, though noticed by Dr. Luthardt, that on the cross Christ's body was not broken (John xix. 36). The expression refers to His body presented in the state of food, as it was at the Last Supper. St. Luke uses the parallel word *given*; and when either of these expressions is used

in Scripture with reference to *eating*, as here, it means to *distribute food*.

(4) *The Administration*.—From the Apostolic teaching concerning the administration and use of the sacrament, it is clear that the Real Presence was assumed as its basis. St. Paul treats of it expressly in 1 Cor. xi. 20-34. The occasion for doing so was the gross misconduct of the Corinthians when assembling to celebrate the Eucharist—excess in eating and drinking, and neglect of the poor (vers. 20-22). His remedy was to recall to their minds the history of the Institution, as the simplest way of making them understand its transcendent holiness. Having done so he draws from the words, *this is My body which is broken for you*, and, *this chalice is the New Testament in My blood*, the following inference: *therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord* (ver. 27). No explanation is needed to tell why the unworthy communicant is guilty of the body and blood of Christ. It lies on the surface of the history just given. The body and blood are there, and they are wantonly profaned by those who receive them in the state of grievous sin. The enormity of the sacrilege arises *objectively* from the holiness of the body that is so treated, and *subjectively* from not *discerning the body of the Lord* (ver. 29) in the sacrament. If, as Dr. Brown says, “nothing is on the Lord’s table from first to last but bread and wine,” St. Paul must have sadly abused the faith of the Corinthians, and unwarrantably exaggerated their criminality.

This appears still more from the effects which he ascribes to an unworthy communion. The first is *eating and drinking judgment to one’s self* (ver. 29), evidently because it is his very judge, whom he discerns not, that

the unworthy communicant introduces into his den of iniquity; and the second is the sickness, and even death (ver. 30), sometimes inflicted by the Judge as an indication of His just anger.

Dr. Brown, however, considers a belief in the Real Presence quite inconsistent with such reckless conduct on the part of the Corinthians. It is, alas! a most deplorable fact, that Catholics who believe in the Real Presence have been known to treat the body and blood of their Lord with even more daring outrage than the Corinthians did: so that the gross misconduct of the latter is no proof that they did not hold the Catholic belief. But the clear language of St. Paul, and the terrible guilt which he attributes to an unworthy communion, and the signal chastisements that followed it, are things totally irreconcilable with the theory, that "the Apostle taught that nothing is on the Lord's table from first to last but bread and wine." Does He not say elsewhere, *The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? and the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?* (1 Cor. x. 16).

From this review of the chief scriptural passages referring to the Eucharist, it is plain that, wherever the sacrament is spoken of or alluded to, whether in the Types of the Old Testament, or in the Promise, the Institution and the Administration of the New, the reality of Christ's body and blood under the sacramental species is always supposed. In the opposite theory words have lost their meaning.

2. *Scriptural grounds for Transubstantiation.*—With Catholics, Lutherans hold the Real Presence of our Lord's body and blood in the Sacrament. But they cling at the same time to the real presence of the bread

and wine, and on that account are said by some to teach consubstantiation, not in the homousion sense, but in contradistinction to the transubstantiation of the Catholic Church. Her doctrine is clearly set forth by the Council of Trent: "If any one saith that, in the sacred and holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood,—the species only of the bread and wine remaining,—which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation, let him be anathema" (Sess. xiii. can. II.) Here are presented two articles of faith quite distinct from belief in the real presence: first, that, at the consecration, the whole substance of the bread and wine ceases to exist in the Sacrament; secondly, that the whole substance of the bread is converted into the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into His blood.

Both these articles are denied by the Lutheran Churches. The schismatical Synod of Pistoia, with most suspicious condescension, gave out that, without throwing any doubt on transubstantiation, there was no need to teach it to the people, who were supposed to be fully instructed on this point, if they admitted the real presence, and the cessation of the substance of the bread and wine, the species alone remaining. The full doctrine, however, of the Church, as we learn from the Council of Trent, and the dogmatic Bull of Pius VI., *Auctorem Fidei*, includes all three articles. In the first is asserted the Real Presence of Christ under the species of bread and wine; in the second the same truth is asserted, with the addition that the substance of the bread and wine is absent; in the third there is the additional declaration, that the whole

substance of the bread and wine has been converted into the body and blood of Christ, with the sanction of the term transubstantiation to express the nature of the change. The first proposition may be admitted by one who denies the two last; the second implies the first, but not the last; but the admission of the last involves the other two.

The term *transubstantiation*, which expresses this doctrine, is one of those happy formulas which the Church, as occasion needs, devises for the clear exposition of her creed. It does not occur in patristic usage, although what it expresses the Fathers decisively maintain. It seems to have come into use at the time that Berengarius was broaching his new opinions on the Eucharist, and was formally sanctioned at the fourth Lateran Council. And truly no word could have been chosen better suited to express the Catholic dogma. *Change* implies no more than a passage from one state to another, positive or negative; *conversion* requires each term of the change to be something positive; *transformation* is a conversion from one form to another, whether substantial or accidental, of which latter *transfiguration* may be said to be a species. It is upon the model of *transformation* and *transfiguration* that the term *transubstantiation* has been formed. In one, *form* passes into *form*, the matter remaining; in the other, *figure* is changed into *figure*, while the substance remains. So in transubstantiation, while the species remain unchanged, it is one *substance* that is converted into another.

It is not difficult to see how those who admit the Real Presence ought to find the dogma of transubstantiation in these words of Christ: *This is my body*. The term of demonstration denoted by *this* is bread, as long as bread exists under the phenomenal environment that brings it within the range of the senses. For the thing pointed

out is naturally the substance so made manifest ; and as long as that remains the pronoun cannot demonstrate any other substance invisibly present under species not its own. Franzelin, whom I am glad to have here as a guide,* illustrates this by an example. If I hold in my hand an apple, and say, *this is gold*, the proposition would appear to be sheer nonsense ; but if I say that I mean the gold coin which (unknown to any one) I have put into the core of the fruit, every one would at once feel that I was sinning against the laws of language in so expressing myself. There are things which, naturally or from convention, are destined to contain something else ; in which case the pronoun *this* naturally denotes the thing contained. I may hold up a cup of wine, or a purse filled with gold, and say, *this is wine*, *this is gold*, without any fear of misapprehension ; for here the container is looked upon as something quite secondary, a natural accident of the thing contained ; and in the same way, as in a demonstrative proposition without the metonymy, the attention is directed, not to the sensible environment, but to the substance naturally existing under it, so, in a proposition with the metonymy, the attention is directed not to the container, but to the thing contained. Now, it will be admitted by every one, that the bread which Christ took into His hands at the Last Supper could not be considered as the mere accident of another thing, and as a vessel destined to act the part of a container. There was nothing in the nature of bread to suggest that idea ; nor had Christ manifested His intention of appointing it for such a purpose.

When, therefore, He said, *This is my body*, the demonstrative pronoun which was directed to the bread could denote nothing else, as long as the bread remained under

* "Tract de SS. Euch. Sac." Rome and Turin, 1868. Thess. xv., p. 238.

its natural species. But the predicate *My body*, affirmed of the demonstrative, shows that the bread no longer remained under its proper species ; for if it did, it would mean that the substance of the bread was the substantial body of Christ, a proposition of the most patent absurdity. *This is My body*, therefore, is a proposition which, in order to be true, requires the demonstrative *this* to be what it affirms it to be in the predicate, that is, the body of Christ under the species of the bread ; yet that cannot be, if under these same species, which naturally indicate bread and no other thing, the substance of the bread remains. For the demonstrative *this* could then mean nothing else but the bread.

Hence, the proposition enunciated by Jesus Christ over the bread, *this is My body*, is equivalent to two propositions, one affirmative and direct, *that which now is under these species is My body* ; the other negative and indirect, *that which now is under these same species is no longer bread*. From which it is evident that the words of Christ are in this case *operative*, and effect what they signify ; for they do not, as in *theoretical* propositions, assume that what they enunciate is true before they are pronounced. The office of the *theoretical* proposition is to *declare* the truth already existing ; that of the *practical* to *make* true what was not so before. It is in virtue of those productive words of Christ that the substance of the bread gives way to the substance of Christ's body ; but, in the act of doing so, leaves behind it its own species for the body of Christ there to take its stead. The inseparability of Christ's body from the soul and the Divinity, also from the blood, necessarily brings by *concomitance* the presence of all, where the body or the blood may be. But otherwise, in virtue of the words, only the substance of the body would be present under the species of bread, and only the substance of the blood under the

species of wine. This is a conversion perfectly unique in creation, and so deserves a name exclusively its own.

From this analysis of the consecrating words we see that transubstantiation is their necessary outcome. It is true that some of the scholastic theologians, leaning exclusively on the authority of the Church, thought that without her living tradition to interpret the precise meaning of Christ's words this doctrine was not the inevitable result. But then it should not be forgotten that this very tradition had the most intimate connection with the words of the Institution, as the Council of Trent declares in the passage already cited from Sess. xiii. ch. iv. : *because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church, etc.*

Concerning the universality of this tradition in the Church I do not mean to make any remark, beyond stating that Dr. Pusey, in his "Doctrine of the Real Presence," has spent much labour in vain to show that the "remaining of the elements in their natural substance was an open question at the beginning of the fifteenth century." He certainly does not meet the arguments of the writer in the *Dublin Review*, whom he undertakes to refute ; and he is answered partially by Garside ("The Sacrifice of the Eucharist," Part II. Transub. and the Scriptures), and fully by Franzelin (*ibid.*, Thess. xiv., xv.)

II.

THE SACRIFICE.

The Eucharist is not only a Sacrament, by means of which we become partakers in the life of Jesus Christ; the Catholic Church holds that it is also a Sacrifice, by means of which man is enabled to give to God a worship worthy of the Divinity.

. Every creature that is endowed with reason owes to God the homage of adoration, praise, and thanksgiving; if he be still in a state of trial petition must be added; and in case he has sinned, Divine justice must be appeased by propitiation. In his present fallen state man has all these duties of religion to discharge. But as there is no proportion between the finite and the infinite, all the human acts involved necessarily fall short of the mark, especially when their essential imperfection is complicated by the consciousness of sin. But now that God has clothed His own Son with our humanity, and so made it possible that the homage of earth should be ever worthy of His majesty, have not His wisdom and Omnipotence kept pace with the claims of His glory, and made Him a Priest for ever upon earth as well as in Heaven? The Catholic Church answers Yes! and tells us that on earth He is the *High Priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek*. For in virtue of the one redeeming Sacrifice of the Cross, God has given Him to us in the Eucharist as a perpetual Priest, offering to Him in our name and at our head such adoration, and thanksgiving, and petition, and propitiation, as are equal to all our requirements, and to all the exigencies of the Divinity. It is, therefore, well worth the pains of those who are not Catholics to enquire,

whether her claim to possess such a treasure in the Mass is well founded. Here but a few hints can be given explanatory of this sacrificial view of the Eucharist.

The want of sacrifice in Protestant worship is a fundamental and essential defect of the system. For sacrifice is the highest form of worship that we can offer to God. Its importance in religion may be estimated by one or two simple considerations. As man is composed of soul and body, both of which, with all that conduces to their well-being and perfection, he owes to God's bounty, his worship cannot be complete unless each of these constituents of his nature bears its appropriate part in the homage tendered. Hence the need of the external as well as the internal element of worship; all the more that acts of the mind, especially if they are of an emotional character, manifest themselves naturally and without effort in external ways, and are intensified in degree by the reaction from without.

Even as an isolated individual, therefore, living apart from all society, every man is bound to give both internal and external worship to God, his Creator and ceaseless Benefactor.

As a member of society he is doubly bound; for, as society is a body whose constitution and preservation and perfection are new favours bestowed by God, over and above the benefits for which the individual as such is indebted, a new obligation arises on the part of society of duly acknowledging this dependence with the advantages which accrue from it. External worship, therefore, in society, and that too sanctioned by the authority empowered to do so, is a matter of religious necessity. And the more perfect the liturgy and ritual and general organization of that worship, the more acceptable will it be to God. Sacrifice is the form which all religious antiquity has pronounced to be the most perfect embodi-

ment of such ideas. For the matter of sacrifice, accordingly, such things were chosen as had the closest analogy and relation to human life, especially such as were adapted to its support. Bread, flour, wine, oil, and the clean domestic animals, were, therefore, appointed as well calculated to symbolize man's dependence on his Maker for life and death. When the sacrificial animal was killed, its blood poured round the altar, and its flesh either wholly or partially burnt, man acknowledged symbolically that his life, with its means of subsistence, was the gift of God, held at His Divine pleasure, and that on account of sin he deserved to have his own blood shed as that of the animal sacrificed; so the bread, oil, and wine, and other things appointed for sacrifice, fell, by their destruction either real or equivalent, into the same category. In the religion revealed to man at the beginning, the victims, the sacrifice, the ritual, and the minister who, in the name of society, was to act as the intermediary between God and man, were all settled by Divine authority.

In addition to the essential features of all sacrifice, a necessary part of the patriarchal and Mosaic systems was the typical representation of the great victim that was to come; so that faith in the Redeemer was involved in the traditional rite of sacrifice. We may, therefore, define sacrifice to be *an offering made to God by a lawful minister, of some material thing, to acknowledge, by its real or equivalent destruction, God's supreme dominion over life and death and all things.*

It would be strange, indeed, if this completest form of religious worship were wanting in the most perfect of all religions—that established by Christ Himself. There is the same need now for sacrificial worship as of old. The difference between the past and the present lies in this, that the ancient sacrifices led up to Jesus Christ, and

were therefore typical ; whereas the present sacrificial worship starts from Jesus Christ, and is therefore commemorative. For it must not be lost sight of, that, in the establishment of the ancient sacrifices, there were two principles at work : first, the need man had, in any case, to acknowledge his entire dependence on God ; secondly, the need he had to manifest, by the typical features of the sacrifice, his belief in the atoning sacrifice to come. When once the real victim, so prefigured, was immolated, the type ceased ; but sacrifice itself was still needed as a necessary part of worship ; and when now the victim was real, the *typical* forecast had to pass into the *commemorative* reality.

Does the Christian religion possess such a sacrifice ? It is found in the Eucharistic rite. The Fathers of the Church (see Bellarmine, "De Euch.," lib. v. c. 10 ; Petavius, "De Incar.," lib. xii. c. 12, n. 12 ; Corn. à Lapide, *in loc.*), and the Council of Trent (Sess. xxii. c. 1) hold for certain that this is clearly foretold in Malachi. His prophecy, from ch. i. 6-iii. 4, divides itself into three parts, closely resembling each other in matter and in structure, viz., ch. i. 6-11, i. 12-14, and ii. 1-iii. 4. In all three the Jewish priesthood, but lately returned from exile, are rebuked for their gross carelessness in the matter of sacrifice, and, as a consequence, the abolition is foretold of the Mosaic temple worship, with the substitution of a new covenant with the Gentiles. We have to consider only the first part, in which we hear the priests reproved for their selfish greed, and for offering on the altar polluted bread, and victims that were blind, or lame, or suffering from disease. The whole denunciation turns on their contemptuous disregard of the liturgy and the external ceremonial of sacrifice. We naturally expect the conclusion to point to an amendment in the conduct of Divine worship ; and it does so by predicting the

abolition of the Mosaic worship, which they so grossly abused, and the introduction of the New Testament public worship in its room. "*I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down My Name is great among the Gentiles ; and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My Name a clean oblation : for My Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.*"

The worship here foretold is that of Messianic times. It is to be established and carried out, not in Jerusalem alone, as the temple sacrifices, but in *every place* ; not in every place of Israel, but of the earth, *from the rising of the sun to the going down* ; not in every place of every country where Israelites may be found, but in every place *among the Gentiles*. The glorification of Jehovah's name among the Gentiles (גִּיּוֹרִים, with the article designating the nations different from Israel) is always among the prophets a characteristic of the Messianic era ; so that Jehovah's refusal to accept then a gift at the hands of the Jewish priests cannot refer to the individuals living in the days of Malachi, but to the entire Levitical priesthood ; which was, therefore, in the time of the Messiah, to be abolished.

With the priesthood the peculiarity of the Levitical worship had to cease. But other priests would be taken from the Gentiles (Isa. lxvi. 21 ; Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18), and they, too, the antitypes of the Levites, would have their sacrificial worship as *in the days of old* (Mal. iii. 3, 4). That the antithesis may be duly observed, it is necessary that this worship should be *external* and *sacrificial*. The words of the prophet deserve careful consideration : מִקְדָּשׁ מִן־שָׁמַי וּמִנְחָה טְהוֹרָה נִבְדָּל־מִקּוֹם. The Vulgate follows one reading, the Protestant version another ; but the variation of reading does not alter the essential

meaning. In either there are three words used to designate the oblation which is to be made by Divine appointment in the new liturgy, and all of them consecrated in the liturgical language of the Old Testament to the ritual of external sacrifice. In this sense קָטַר, with its derivatives, occurs 146 times, קָטַר in *Piel* and *Hiphil* 12 times, and קָטַר 154 times. None of these three liturgical terms is ever used of *internal* worship, and when they are used, as in our case, of *external Divine worship*, they refer exclusively to offerings which are truly sacrificial. What accumulative force, therefore, they are meant to have, when all three are used in the same immediate context! (See Franzelin, *ibid.*, Thes. x.)

The verb קָטַר is generally supposed to be most applicable to the fragrant vapour of incense, but it is quite as applicable to the burnt offerings which smelled sweetly before Jehovah. It is therefore not confined to incense, but takes in all kinds of sacrifice, and is even applied to the bloodless offering of the *minkhah*, as Jeremiah has, הִקְטִיר מִנְחָה (ch. xxxiii. 18), in a passage analogous to this one of Malachi. In the same connection קָטַר in *Hiphil* is met with in Mal. ii. 12; iii. 3; Amos v. 25. So that קָטַר, followed, as these two words are, by מִנְחָה in the form of apposition, simply means a *bloodless sacrifice is offered*. For such is the proper liturgical meaning of the *minkhah*. Once only does it apply to a bleeding sacrifice, that of Abel (Gen. iv. 4). And the reason may be owing to the fact that Cain's offering had been so designated, or that when that early chapter of Genesis was composed the liturgical language of Moses had not been fixed.

The characteristics of the new sacrificial worship were thus to be universality of place, a Gentile priesthood, a pure, bloodless immolation, intrinsic excellence of the victim, which could never be unclean or liturgically imperfect, and a signal glorification of the Divine name in

every nation of the globe. They are all to be found in the Eucharistic sacrifice offered everywhere, and co-extensive with the universality of the Catholic Church, the priesthood not confined to a tribe, but chosen from all nations, the form of the sacrifice the species of bread and wine, the victim hidden beneath the sacramental veils no other than Christ Himself.

It is the same thing which our Lord foretold to the Samaritan woman (John iv. 20-24), the abolition of Mosaic sacrifice peculiar to the temple of Jerusalem, substitution of a Catholic sacrifice, in which there would be no more type nor flesh of animal victims, but the *truth* that fulfilled the *figure*, and the *spirit* that gave life and meaning to the outward ceremonial.

Coming now to the Institution, we take for granted what has been already demonstrated, that Christ at the Last Supper gave to His apostles His real body and blood. That He offered Himself then, body and blood, by way of sacrifice, is made very clear by the words of St. Luke, xxii. 20. I take here the Protestant version, which retains the present participle, like the Greek original: *This cup is the New Testament in My blood, which is shed for you.* Referring to the Greek, we see that the words, *which is shed for you*, agree with the *cup*, and not with the *blood*; so that our Lord says, *This cup which is shed for you is the New Testament in My blood.* The figure of speech is the ordinary metonymy, where the *container* stands for the *contained*. Its use here shows that it is not the shedding of Christ's blood upon the cross that was meant; for the cup containing the blood was not poured out upon the cross. It refers necessarily to what was in the cup at the moment. That, as we have already seen, was His real blood; whence it is evident that He put His blood in a sacramental state in the chalice under the species of wine: which action He

declares to be the *shedding of His blood* for the apostles, and *for many unto the remission of sins*.

In all the animal sacrifices, typical of our Lord's sacrifice on the cross, the destruction of the victim's life comes about by the shedding of the blood. It was so also on the cross. Hence *the shedding of blood* is a phrase which in Scripture is frequently used to denote the sacrifice itself (Acts xx. 28; Rom. iii. 25; v. 9; Eph. i. 7; ii. 13; Col. i. 14, 20; Heb. *passim*; 1 Peter i. 2, 19; 1 John i. 7; Apoc., frequently). It is, therefore, a sacrificial expression, and so is to be interpreted in our case. But how does this expression apply to the Eucharist? Franzelin (*loc. cit.*) remarks that blood may be shed in three ways: *materially*, without any sacred reference; *sacrificially and really*, as on the cross; *sacrificially and mystically*, as in the Eucharist. Here the very same victim, that offered Himself on the cross by the physical effusion of His blood, places Himself under the species of bread and wine upon the altar in the *formal state* of victim; and as this victim state is the state of sacrifice, the formal placing of the blood externally in the chalice as separated from the body is denominated, with reference to the sacrifice of the cross, the *shedding of the blood*. In virtue of the consecrating words, the blood comes under the species of wine, and the body under the species of bread. There is, of course, no real separation between the body and the blood in the Eucharist; but there is a representation, by the separate consecration, of that parting of the blood from the body which consummated the sacrifice of Calvary. That is the meaning of the mystic *shedding of the real blood* in the Holy Eucharist.

This sacrificial character of the Last Supper is confirmed by the sacrificial import of the words used by our Lord on the occasion. In St. Paul's Greek (1 Cor. xi. 24) we have, *My body, which is broken for you*. As already

remarked, the verb to *break*, when it refers to what is to be eaten, signifies, in Biblical language, to *distribute as food*. The force of the expression, therefore, is, *this is My body, which is now laid before you in the shape of food*. It is equivalent to St. Luke's, *this is My body, which is given for you* (ch. xxii. 19), words expressive of sacrifice; for they correspond not only with John vi. 51, but with the analogous words applied to the blood in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, as *shed for you, shed for many, for many unto the remission of sins*.

In his learned contribution to the Symposium, Dr. Littledale draws attention to the sacrificial significance of *do ye, memorial, covenant*. The verb *ποιέω* especially occurs very frequently as the equivalent of the verb to *sacrifice*. By suggesting *see ye* instead of *do ye*, Dr. Brown has entirely done away with the sacrificial import of the expression.

It is in the mass, therefore, which is the only Eucharistic sacrifice, that we are to find the sacred rite which the Lord commanded the Apostles to observe, in remembrance of Him and of His death, until such time as He should come back to earth to judge the living and the dead. And it is easy to understand how naturally the Fathers of the Church and the ancient Liturgies take the *bread and wine* of Melchisedek as figures of the perennial sacrifice offered by the *priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek*. The accentuation of the Hebrew original of Gen. xiv. 18 puts the priesthood of Melchisedek in immediate connection with the bread and wine which he brought out, and is well represented by S. Jerome's Vulgate: *Melchisedech Rex Salem proferens panem et vinum (erat enim sacerdos Dei Altissimi)*. The reason for his bringing out the bread and wine was not to refresh the warriors (who had been abundantly supplied already from the stores of Sodom, ver. 24), but, as a priest of

the Most High, to offer sacrifice, according to the rite distinctively his own, for the great Patriarch. The blessing which followed was another function of his priesthood. But the accentuation of the original places a full stop between the enunciation of his priesthood and the blessing, whereas it brings the priesthood into close connection with the bread and wine. This of itself would show what the learned accentuators thought of the matter, had we not the express authority of some of the Rabbis to the same effect. Among the rest R. Phinees says distinctly: *In the time of the Messiah all sacrifices shall cease; but the sacrifice of bread and wine shall not cease, according to Gen. xiv. and Psalm cx.* (See Bellarmine, "De Missa," lib. v. c. vi.)

How, then, does it happen that St. Paul, who discourses so largely on the points of analogy between the priesthood of Melchisedek and that of Christ, passes over so striking a resemblance? The reason is found in the object he had in view. It was to show the superiority of Christ's priesthood over that of Aaron. For that purpose he takes the priesthood of Melchisedek as his term of comparison, and that he shows to have been superior to the other. How much more the priesthood of Christ, of which Melchisedek's was but a figure! It is not, however, every typical phrase of Melchisedek's priesthood that he deals with. Much of that he omits as unsuitable for the moment (Heb. v. 11), and consequently all that corresponded with it in the real priesthood of Christ. As he makes no allusion to the distinctive sacrifice of the Melchisedekian rite, which, being bread and wine, was not in itself superior to the goats and oxen in the Aaronic system, it was not necessary to speak of the Christian sacrifice in this connection. And yet he does allude to it in Heb. xiii. 10-13: *We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle; that is,*

we Christians (like the Jews) *have* in actual present use (like the Jews) *a real* accessible altar (like the Jews), *an altar* from which food is actually taken and eaten (like that of the Jews), but of which *we alone* (and not the Jews) *have the power to eat*. Surely that means something more than the altar of the cross, which then had ceased to be an altar, from which no such food was taken as the Jews took from theirs, and of which, inasmuch as it furnished spiritual food, the Jew had to partake before he became a Christian. (See Garside, *ibid.*, "Teaching of St. Paul," p. 23.)

The objection, however, that is most generally levelled against the sacrifice of the mass is, that it is supposed to be a blasphemous negation of the all-sufficiency of the atoning sacrifice of the cross. Repeated as it is for the ten thousandth time, for the ten thousandth time the answer may be repeated.

And here I must remonstrate with Dr. Littledale, who represents it as a popular opinion in the sixteenth century, "that each mass was in some sense an independent offering, and separate from that of Calvary—a view now generally repudiated even by the Roman Church." For it could never have been a popular opinion among Catholics; and it is a view not *generally*, but *universally* repudiated, not only *now*, but in *all ages* by the Roman Church. The Catholic Church has ever preached the all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of the cross in the sense that St. Paul does. The merit of redemption and the satisfaction for sin accomplished by that sacrifice were such, that there is, and can be, no sin for which full atonement has not been offered by Christ and accepted by God; yet every man has not his sins actually forgiven, nor will every man be actually saved. There are conditions required, and means appointed to make these satisfactions our own; nor does co-operation on the part of man interfere

with the fulness of Christ's sacrifice. It is, therefore, necessary for us to comply with the conditions, and make use of the channels through which these graces are conveyed to our souls. The aqueduct that stretches over the Roman Campagna brings from the reservoir among the hills the water that sparkles and refreshes in the fountains of the city. The sacrifice of the mass is the great aqueduct that brings to us the waters that flowed from the heart of our Lord into the reservoir of Calvary; and the more efficacy we attribute to the mass, the more we exalt the virtues of Calvary. The mass, then, derives every advantage that it has from Calvary alone: the Victim is the same, the Chief Priest is the same, the dignity of Christ's person is the same; and as Christ can acquire no new merits, and make no more atonement, the whole meritorious efficacy and atoning virtue is exclusively that of Calvary. But the daily representation in the mass of the Sacrifice of Calvary, by the priest and victim of the one actually present in the other, propitiates Divine justice, not so as to present a new atonement, but to impetrate in individual cases grace for the living to repent of sin, and for the living and the dead the remission of such temporal punishment, either in part or in whole, as may be still due. That is what is meant by the propitiatory virtue ascribed to the mass; and it is what our Lord Himself expressed in the first mass, when He said: *This is My body, which is given and broken for you; this is My blood, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins.*

The Holy Eucharist, then, whether as a sacrifice or a sacrament, is the grand centre of all Catholic devotion. It supplies us with a worship, in which Christ exhibits Himself on earth, as the *Priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek* (Psalm cx. 4), and as the Lamb-victim standing, as it were, slain (Apoc. v. 6); a worship which,

as it is the liturgical fulfilment of all the patriarchal and Mosaic sacrifices, embraces in itself alone all the ends of sacrifice, adoration, praise, thanksgiving, impetration, and propitiation ; a worship *in spirit and in truth* (John iv. 24), in which the Son Himself adores the Father, and unites with Himself as their head all the members of His mystical body, making of them *true adorers* with Himself ; a worship, universal in place, as in the Church, and ceaseless in time, as the revolution of the globe brings round to every place successively the hour for sacrifice to begin. As a sacrament, it incorporates us with Christ, giving us His *very flesh to eat*, and His *very blood to drink*, that we may live in Him, and He in us, and each worthy communicant may say with St. Paul, *I live, now not I ; but Christ liveth in me* (Gal. ii. 20). And so by contact with the glorified humanity of Christ, we have sown in our very bodies, as well as souls, the seeds of that glorious immortality that are to ripen at the general resurrection, and blossom into the beatific vision, when we shall see God *as He is* for evermore. Meanwhile, in the Catholic Churches where the sacred species are preserved, we enjoy the ineffable comfort and delight of His Real Presence, unseen though He may be ; and we may go at any hour of the day or night to visit Him and pour our sorrows into His tender heart, and to adore Him as our Creator, and Redeemer, and ceaseless Benefactor. It is this Presence of our Lord that gives so sacred a character to the Catholic Temple, and makes it God's house, and the dwelling-place of His glory. It was foreshadowed in the symbolical presence of Jehovah both in the Tabernacle of the wilderness, and in the Holy of Holies at the dedication of Solomon's Temple. In the second temple there was no symbolical presence, because there was reserved for it the honour of Christ's real presence, though transient. And was the

Christian temple to be less glorious than its ancient figures? It was to have the fulfilment of these types in the constant permanence of Christ's Real Presence under the Sacramental veils. All its glories are summed in the lost words of the prophet Ezekiel, speaking of it after the King had entered : and *the name of the city from that day, is, The Lord is there.*

W. SMITH, D.D.

Pro-Cathedral, Edinburgh.

VII.

THE fact that this paper is intended as a presentation of the New Church doctrine on the Holy Supper renders necessary some prefatory remarks on the standard of reference to which appeal will be made.

Emanuel Swedenborg himself claims to speak and write under a commission of the highest character. He affirms that the Lord's Second Advent, having as one of its ends the establishment "of a New Church, which is the New Jerusalem," is not a *personal* presence and manifestation of Himself in the world, but is effected "by the instrumentality of a man who is able not only to receive the doctrines of that Church in his understanding, but also to make them known by the press." He further says that since the first day of his call to this office he never received anything relating to the doctrines of that Church from any angel, but from the Lord alone, while he was reading the Word ("True Christian Religion," hereinafter cited as "T. C. R.," 779).

These claims are not now adduced for discussion, but to explain the position of the present writer. Swedenborg, it will be understood, claims a right to the most absolute conviction that what he has written is not the embodiment of his own thinking, but the expression of doctrines divinely true. He does not, however, require that what he has written shall on that ground be received as true. For every member of the Church he indicates an important trinal connection between the Word, its

genuine doctrine, and the true disciple of that doctrine. Let this be briefly stated.

1. "Doctrine ought to be drawn from the literal sense of the Word, and to be confirmed thereby," . . . "because the Lord is present in that sense, teaching and enlightening the mind" ("T. C. R.," 229). 2. "The word without doctrine is unintelligible," and "the Word by means of doctrine is not only understood, but also sheds abroad light in the understanding, for it is like a candelabrum with kindled lamps. Then does a man see more than first he saw, and understands also what he had not before understood ; obscurities and discordances he either sees not and so passes, or seeing them he shows how they agree with doctrine" ("T. C. R.," 266-7). 3. "Genuine truth, which must pertain to doctrine, appears in the literal sense of the Word to none but such as are in illumination from the Lord. This illumination (*illustratio*) is from the Lord only, and is with those who love truths because they are true, and who apply them to the uses of life" ("T. C. R.," p. 231). Thus doctrine is the guide, the Word is the authority, and the successful student is the lover of truth, who seeks to practise all that he learns. Such a one, so guided, will in the literal sense of the Word find more than that literal sense, even the living truth which forms genuine doctrine ; for while he by his actual study of the Word is storing his memory with facts and statements, and is thus furnishing his understanding with materials on which its faculties may be exercised, his moral earnestness will permit the influx of Divine truth to descend through his interior mind into these externally-acquired knowledges so as to make them as it were vessels filled with treasures of heavenly wisdom and knowledge. In other words, the Word is the *criterion* of doctrine, doctrine is the *interpreter* of the Word, the *authority* being the Lord Himself, whose inspiration gives

to man understanding by means of word and doctrine conjointly, but *through* that spirit which is in man. The conditions for this inspiration are external and internal—external information and internal affection, or desire for goodness and truth.

In prosecuting the subject of this symposium, the writer must therefore bring with him reverence and charity, and must apply every statement of doctrine to the touch-stone of the Word, and must at the same time seek to see how the doctrine taught discloses that light within the Word which makes it now more fully and effectively than ever a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our path (Psalm cxix. 105).

The Holy Supper and Baptism are equally received and enjoined by Church authority as holy and divine, and are credited with a lofty significance. What their significance is, is strangely enough still a matter under discussion, as indeed our "Symposium" testifies. On this our author says, "Without some notion of the spiritual sense of the Word no one can be aware of what the two sacraments, Baptism and the Holy Supper, involve and effect" ("T. C. R.," 667). And again, "Without a knowledge of the correspondences of things natural with things spiritual no one can know the use and profit of the Holy Supper" ("T. C. R.," 698). It is then maintained that the Word of God has not only a literal sense, patent (though not always easily intelligible) to every reader, but beyond, or rather within, this a spiritual sense, connected with and embodied in the literal sense by what is here called the correspondence of things natural and things spiritual. So that all natural and mundane objects, persons, places, and events are really connected with and significant of those spiritual realities, relations, and events which constitute the spiritual sense of the Word.

We are told then that without some notion of this spiritual sense, without some knowledge of these correspondences, we cannot know what is involved in and effected by the sacraments, and especially, for our present purpose, cannot know the use and profit of the Holy Supper.

In this series of papers it will not be permitted to appeal at once to this spiritual sense, to these correspondences. We are justly commanded to pause: the *festina lente* fitly takes the form of these words from Dr. Luthardt, "It (the bread) is not merely an image and sign and pledge of His body. How could it be such? What would be the *tertium comparationis*?" (p. 3).

Our saying, therefore, that the bread or the wine in the Lord's Supper corresponds with the body or the blood of the Saviour Himself, may and indeed must mean more than an affirmation of their merely symbolic character. Many symbols are absolutely arbitrary; e.g. the symbols of operation and of known and unknown quantity or magnitude in mathematical analysis; the fields, charges, and labels of heraldry; numerical and alphabetic characters, and some hieroglyphs of modern invention, etc. In all these cases the symbol is so because it has been chosen or invented to serve that turn; there is no real correspondence. The case is different when light is not assumed, but recognized, as a symbol and fit representative of truth. Light, unperceived except as revealer and revelation of the objects which reflect it, or of the media by which it is refracted, is like that living operation of human intelligence by which spiritual objects and media are revealed in their relation to minds, to beings of a spiritual nature. Correspondence is thus affirmed between things natural and things spiritual when it is seen that they resemble one

another in their modes of operation, and thus serve like uses in their respective worlds, the visible and the invisible, the natural and the spiritual.

Here we might pause to note that this definition of correspondence is borne out by the mode in which the Lord speaks of His body or flesh, and of His blood : "Take, eat ; this is My body" (Matt. xxvi. 26 ; Mark xiv. 22). "This is My body which is given for you" (Luke xxii. 19). "The Bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. I am the Bread of life : he that cometh to Me shall never hunger ; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst. I am that Bread of life. This is the Bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living Bread which came down from heaven ; if any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever : and the Bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last day. For My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father : so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me. This is that Bread which came down from heaven : not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead : he that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever" (John vi. 33, 35, 48, 50, 51, 53-58). "Drink ye all of it ; for this is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 27 ; Mark xiv. 24 ; Luke xxii. 20).

In these passages we see a clear identification of uses as subsisting between—(1) bread and wine ; (2) body or

flesh, and blood ; (3) those spiritual realities which give us the necessary elements of our spiritual life and growth, and which need to be taken and assimilated by means of some act or acts of our own, which themselves correspond to eating and drinking.

But, though we may already say we have some notion, some knowledge of correspondences, and therefore of the spiritual sense of these passages, we must go further.

The theist recognizes everywhere manifestations of the Divine ; the monotheist, of one Divine Being ; and the Christian finds, wherever he looks, proofs of one Divine Being, all of whose qualities, powers, and attributes are infinitely human. Our philosophy sees in every human act or work the presence indeed of a man's power or operation ; but, therewith and therein, also, the presence of a man's volition and thought. Will first, then intelligence, then power. These form a man's act. The material embodiment has for us value mainly as these mental and moral realities are enshrined therein. Without these—will, thought, and operation—there is no human work. But the presence of these will be effectual in making the work itself a visible picture of the man, in so far as he has embodied his heart, mind, and might in the work. Thus, for some purposes, one of my rough sketches may stand for my symbol, while another drawing may be the symbol for Turner, or Landseer. Do you object now to the word symbol? You are right ; the sketch, or the drawing, is the actual presentation of Turner's, Landseer's, or my own aims, means, and act ; one or other of them is art, the third is mere shaped want of art. Yet the art is a mental and spiritual quality ; that which we call art as it hangs in our galleries is the correspondent form of that which alone is truly art.

Thus a correspondence will be justly affirmed when a

material thing resembles in its operation and uses a spiritual reality, and that by no accidental likeness, but because the spiritual reality is a prime cause, which has embodied itself in the material form.

When the Lord creates, He, and not some part of the indivisible God, creates, and thus the created is an embodiment of His love, His wisdom, and His power. There are these elements, if we may borrow the term from physical science,—there are these elements in each thing created. And the common dogma, that the Lord created all things out of nothing, is only so far true as it asserts that in every created thing the Divine love, wisdom, and power are embodied; and besides the embodiment of these, yea, beside these three, there is nothing else.

Thus each and every object, natural, material, finite, is not so much a symbol of a Divine volition, thought, and act, as it is that Divine volition and thought to which a Divine act has given substance and form and use in the visible universe.

All things are therefore embodiments of Divine power, and perhaps all things equally so; and each several thing is the embodiment of one of the infinite volitions, one of the innumerable ideas, of the Divine source of all.

Thus, then, the light, the revealer of physical nature, is not so much a symbol of truth as it is truth itself, immanent in the physical universe as a revealer.

Our definition now assumes this completer form. Correspondence is likeness between the natural and the spiritual, and it exists because the natural is the embodiment of that spiritual which it represents, because the essence of the natural is, though on a lower plane, identical with the spiritual essence which is at once its analogue and cause.

Thus, and this is but apparently a digression, water in

baptism, water for cleansing, water as solvent, as refreshment and thirst-quencher, water in all its uses, is one of the myriad material forms of truth. And, on the other hand, Divine truth solving difficulties, refreshing our spirits, satisfying our thirst, healing and cleansing us,—truth in all these operations is the water of life, which goeth forth out of the sanctuary, and flows from beneath the throne of God and the Lamb.

Jesus said of the bread, "This is My body." This we interpret on the principle of correspondence. Our justification in so doing is manifold, and does not consist only in the fact that Swedenborg, a Divinely instructed teacher, bids us so interpret it. He, Divinely taught, indicates to us a path which leads to many truths, and to much both of precept and promise. Having received from his pen the hints needful to start us, let us walk, as it were, independently, trying to track down the living truth, the spiritual life, which is in these words.

Jesus took bread, . . . and said, "This is My body." Conjoint testimony of Evangelists and of Paul assures us of the fact. These are His words. They are true words also, as all His words are, for He is the Word of God, a teacher sent from God, the faithful, the true witness, the truth itself, as well as the way and the life. These words, then, are so bound up with the Gospels that they must be true, or else the whole Gospel, the whole Word, as we call it, must be rejected. The Bread, so taken, broken, blessed, and given, is indeed His body; "not merely an image and sign and pledge of His body," as Dr. Luthardt has fitly said. What is the bread? Our answer must be true to the doctrine which is derived from, and which interprets the Word; but, at the same time, our answer will be according to our mental and spiritual state. The seed is the Word of God, and can only grow fruitfully in the ground of an honest and good heart; and so growing

it will, not because of differences in the seed, but because of differences inherent in the spiritual condition of the recipient, bring forth in some thirty, in some sixty, in some a hundred fold.

Jesus took bread,—it was bread that He blessed,—and brake and gave. What is bread? We may answer chemically and physiologically, and say, Bread is the united form of the essential elements of all nutriment for the body. What belongs to the life of the blood is there, what constitutes the firmness of bone, and the contractile strength of muscle, and all that through the life of the lungs keeps up the vital warmth of the body,—all this is there ; it is the one most perfect food.

Again, bread is the purest and most nutritive form in which wheat can be presented to the palate and stomach, and thence to the heart and life. And the wheat is no chance-gathered manna ; it is the seed of a plant which has never been discovered wild, and which needs a whole course of skilled industry and of patient faith in order that there may be bread for the eater, bread for Jesus to take and break and bless, and give to His disciples as His body. Once again, bread is from wheat, and that from the seed corn ; that is, bread is the result of a God-given principle of life, which had power to make sunshine and rain, the wandering air and crumbled rock, and the decayed elements of the soil, into food ; that is, into a continuance of human life, into maintenance and renewal of physical vigour, even into mental activity ; and thus into means of learning, into acquirement of knowledge and wisdom, and into the strength and beauty of personal holiness. Had not David eaten the shewbread from before the presence of Jehovah he had not sung, “I will bless Jehovah at all times ; His praise *shall* continually *be* in my mouth. . . . Jehovah redeemeth the soul of His servants ; and none of them

that trust in Him shall be desolate " (Psalm xxxiv.) We should not have had Psalm, Prophecy, or Evangel had not the Lord, in some form or other, provided seed for the sower, that there might also be bread for the eater.

Bread which becomes body was wheat. Look now at something else, say at a huge cannon that can, five miles off, sink a vast vessel, and slay hundreds of men at once. That gun is not mere iron or steel ; it is contrivance, contrivance to kill ; it is a concrete form of the perverted intelligence, the evil moral outcome of modern un-Christian civilization ; it is the mind of man consecrated to slaughter. So we might find many embodiments of the human mind, of man's will and thought, employed in works of benevolence. Let us, however, confine our attention to Divine works. Some of these are for our comfort ; some bring discomfort with them. I ask a man, "What have you?" He answers, "I have prosperity," or, "I have adversity." He may wisely amend his answer, and say that he has the wise goodness of the Lord, for all these things *are* the Divine Providence: for one man this Providence is purple and fine linen, with daily sumptuous fare ; and for another it is the gathered broken food from the table of the rich. It is in such ways that love and wisdom, goodness and truth, come down into the sphere of human earthly life.

But they come down also into the material world. A child plays with a pebble, and unconsciously holds in his hand an expression of Divine wisdom in a material form. I cannot tell how the Divine is waiting in that water-rolled stone, not for what work it is reserved ; but when the use is found, then that use is a result of the Divine that is there embodied. David discovered it once, and slew Israel's foe, and we shall understand the meaning of a pebble when to us, as victors, there are given white stones, and in each a new name known to its recipient.

alone. In a word, things are not what they seem ; there is nothing which is not more than it appears. Every seed is an embodiment of Divine wisdom. The seeds of darnel and hemlock, so far as they are evil, are perverted and violated forms of the living truth ; while of wheat it is written, The seed is the Word of God. This is not a mere comparison. How could it be ? What is the common element, the common measure, by reference to which comparison is made ? The seed is by correspondence to be identified with the Word of God, because what the Word is in man's spiritual history, that the seed is externally and materially. It is a revelation of the Lord. It has such life that, when fitly planted, warmed, and watered, it can subdue the inorganic and lifeless, even the dead and decayed, and from all can draw, under sunshine, the force and form of a new and multiplying life, just as the Word can fill the recipient heart with use and living beauty that can fix the floating air of opinion, and change external but heaven-sent showers of knowledge and the sun-like warmth of the Lord's love into that form and force which we call a man—a man in God's image and likeness. The seed is all but useless except as promise of bread, the staff of life, or rather the very form in which continuance and new vigour of life is given. The Word is well-nigh worthless, save as it is the promise and means of goodness, the staff of spiritual life, or rather the solid form of that life. The Word is the seed, and the bread is the good in which that seed results. The bread is the material form of that spiritual goodness which is the strength and substance of spiritual life, the body of that life. Where but in the body do we see most clearly the active form of living vigour ? and the body is but the vivified form of food. The seed becomes the bread-corn, as truth grows into goodness in the receptive heart and mind ; and this good,

like bread, becomes, and is, the life of man, in its form and substance. Thus the Lord said of the bread, "This is My body." The body is but the final and perfect living form of bread, and is emphatically the material form of the Lord's love and of human goodness, prepared for appropriation and assimilation by man ; so that of our body may be said with reverence, This is the bread which cometh down from heaven ; as of the body we may say with loving awe, This, too, is, in its finite way, the Word made flesh. There is then no mere figure of speech, no rhetorical form, no bold comparison, when of bread and wine Jesus says, "This is My body, and this My blood."

Less in detail must we speak of the wine. This cannot be severed in thought from water, at least while we study its correspondential character. Each and either of them corresponds, and is thus substantially related to truth. Truth is not single and solitary in its relation to the human mind ; truth, as revealer and revelation, is mental and spiritual light, and light is its most general correspondential symbol. Truth, as we appropriate it in order to quench our mental thirst, and, as implied in this, to satisfy our spiritual organic needs, this is water or wine. They represent, because they embody, truth, though in different degrees and with different intrinsic value. There is the first truth that meets with and fulfils the craving of our spiritual nature ; is not this the truth that tells of law as law, and enforces upon us the demands of duty as duty ? Cold and clear is truth, thirst-quenching, indeed, but not at the same time joy-giving in the higher sense. The spiritual truth, which forgets not law, but shows it as the expression of the Lord's love, contriving us for bliss, and bliss for us ; the truth which cheers us to the fulfilling of all that duty demands, not, however, as demanded by duty, but as satisfying with delight a

heaven-born love of the neighbour ; is not this a form of truth which is as wine that cheereth the heart of man, because it cheereth also the heart of God, whose image man is ? Call these briefly—water, the truth of duty ; wine, the truth of charity and love. Then reflect, that at Cana in Galilee, at a marriage, water, which was for purifying, became wine, the quencher of thirst and giver of gladness. Truth passes, as the beginning of miracles, of spiritual workings of the Lord, from a lower to a higher form ; external knowledge becomes a spiritual, that is, an internal, apprehension of Divine truth. In this is the Divine glory “manifested forth,” and this happens whenever, and wherever, and in whatever form is repeated the experience of Sychar, “Now we believe, not because of thy saying ; for we have heard *Him* ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the anointed, the Saviour of the world.” The wine of the Holy Supper is therefore a material form and embodiment, say the outcome on the material plane of existence, of the Lord’s Divine truth.

This is yet more evident as we consider wine in its relation to blood. The Divine is known to us in two grand moral essentials, namely, love and wisdom, or goodness and truth, and in their union in Divine might. Man is an image of God, and that universally—an image of God in his bodily, in his mental, in his spiritual life, and in the union of these. In man’s bodily life the Divine image is found in the flesh, blood, and their conjoined vitality, powers, and operations. Of these the flesh (called body) is distinctively the embodiment of love or goodness, and the blood that of wisdom or truth. It is the love of the Lord which is given for the life of the world ; he that appropriates this Divine goodness, and makes it his own, his own life, shall live for ever, and shall never hunger for other good. It is the truth

as it is in Jesus, that is the blood of the covenant, the means of satisfying spiritual thirst for ever, and of uniting heart and mind in the worshipper in a genuine life, and of bringing the receptive worshipper himself into a genuine union and conjunction with the Lord. By these, by His goodness and truth, He satisfies the longing soul, and fills the hungry soul with good.

Thus, then, the Holy Supper is a symbolical feast. The devout recipient takes food and drink, by which his physical life is nourished and refreshed. He is reminded of the Lord's love and wisdom, of His sacrifice and self-revelation, in the grand works of redemption and salvation; and thus his reception of the "elements" is an act done "in remembrance" of the Lord, and has, therefore, a spiritual value; he actually receives the love and wisdom, the body and blood, of the Lord, as these are embodied in the "elements." This reception is *implicit* in every case, and *explicit* in so far as the recipient is prepared for the recognition and reception of the Divine substance, which is present in this act of worship. This last assertion may be illustrated by the experience of Emmaus. The Lord had been with His disciples, as He is with us all, though the world know Him not, the darkness comprehends Him not. The Lord had been with His disciples though "their eyes were holden that they should not know Him." Instruction was given both by educing what they knew and had both hoped and believed, and by giving to them new knowledges by the unfolding of that spiritual sense which was before them in Moses and all the prophets, even though in relation to this also their eyes had been holden. A new life of affection, of affectionate desire for truth as a means to goodness, was quickened within them (did not the heart burn within them?). They will not part from their Teacher, so He will not leave them. Their inter-

course with the Lord becomes a feast, and He taking bread, blessed, brake, and gave to them. The end of worship is the conferring of Divine goodness on the worshipper. Then Jesus was recognized, and in that moment vanished out of their sight. The Lord did not therefore quit them, but heretofore He had been without them seeking access to their life ; He had been sometimes nearer, sometimes more remote. Now that they were fed by Him, His promise could be fulfilled, "Lo, I am with you alway ;" now that He was become their life, He who had been with them a visible Comforter, could be with them abidingly, giving them Himself in nearer and more precious form, another Comforter, and yet not another, as He said, "I will not leave you comfortless (orphans, or bereaved) ; I come unto you." The same Comforter of which, while His visible presence on earth lasted, He had said, "He dwelleth with you," could now accomplish His word, "He shall be in you ;" so that henceforth He should be known not physically, but spiritually, "not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

The sanctity, therefore, of the Holy Supper, as also the significance of its elements, is not by arbitrary association, but results from a real presence in the elements, under material form, of the spiritual elements of goodness and truth. This real presence is an initial fact, a constituent fact of the bread and wine, just as life, the presence of a living soul, is the initial and constituent fact of flesh and blood. The soul takes to itself form in the world as it builds up our frames of flesh and blood. The bread as bread is the Divine lovingkindness, the wine as wine is the Divine, quickening, joy-inspiring truth ; and thus the words of the institution are not transmutative nor creative. It is not said, Let this be ; but, This is My body, and this, the new covenant in My blood. The value of the Holy Supper is not in a new value of the elements, but in a

new recognition of their previous and perpetual character. In it the devout, if duly instructed, is saved from the sadness of entertaining angels *unawares*; he learns that all life is holy, and every gift is the sacramental presence of the Lord, so that in it he recognizes as present, and as *his*, the only wise God, our Saviour, and says, This is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us: this is Jehovah; we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation.

The following extract is from Swedenborg's "Apocalypse Explained," and is adduced as a brief exposition, in such form as he employed, of the significance of the elements in the Holy Supper:

"The angels" (for present purposes, and to avoid occasion for unnecessary controversy, we may understand him to say, men of spiritual character, rightly instructed unto the kingdom of heaven) "understand by the Paschal Supper the same as by the Holy Supper instituted by the Lord, in which bread and wine take the place of a lamb; and then the Lord said that the bread was His flesh, and the wine was His blood. And every one is, or may be, aware that bread and wine are nourishers of the body—bread as food, and wine as drink; and that in the Word, which is interiorly spiritual, these are to be spiritually understood: so that bread is to be interpreted of all spiritual food, and wine of all spiritual drink. The spiritual food is all good that is communicated and given to man by the Lord, and spiritual drink is all truth that is so communicated and given. These two, good and truth, or love and faith, constitute the spiritual man: . . . Hence it may be seen, that by bread is meant the Divine good of the Lord's Divine love, and with relation to a man, that good as it is received by him; and by the wine is meant the Divine truth as it proceeds from the Divine good of the Lord's Divine love, and with relation

to a man, that truth as it is received by him. In that the Lord said that the bread is His flesh, and the wine is His blood, it is evident that the Lord's flesh means the Divine good of His Divine love, and that eating the flesh means the reception of that good, its appropriation to one's self, and thus (the worshipper's) conjunction with the Lord; and that by the Lord's blood, and by drinking it, are meant the Divine truth proceeding from the Divine good of the Lord's Divine love, its reception and its appropriation. Spiritual nutrition also is by the good and truth which proceed from the Lord."

"It is because by wine is meant the Divine truth, nourishing spiritual life, that the Lord says, 'I say unto you, I will not drink of this fruit of the vine, until the day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom.' Whence it is clear that what is meant is spiritual, for He says that He will drink it with them, and that in the kingdom of God, or in heaven, and that He will also eat with them there of the paschal lamb. . . . Since blood signifies that Divine truth which proceeds from the Lord, and since conjunction with the Lord is effected through its reception by man, the blood is called by the Lord the blood of the covenant" ("A. E.," 329).

Here the doctrine is seen to be wider than it had seemed, and as it is further examined is found to be ever the deeper; it flows in abundance, like the holy waters of Ezekiel's vision. "Afterward he measured a thousand; and it was a river that I could not pass over: for the waters were risen, waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over." It is because of the infirmities of man's senses, each limited to one class of impressions, each speaking but one language, that we distinguish and divide the one radiant energy of the sun into light for vision and warmth for feeling. So it is, because of the at least partial divorce between will and understanding,

that we imagine a disjunction of the Lord's goodness and truth, His love and wisdom, even as the Churches have come to sever faith from charity, and to oppose the one to the other. The inseparable essentials of the Lord we view separately, and this the Lord both permits and uses as a means to our salvation. There exists such a separation in our spirits ; will and understanding, affection and thought, in us are not one, are not even at one. This is of the Lord's mercy, and how great is that mercy may partly appear if we consider the case of a corrupt but undivided human nature. Say that the will, all that is dominant in man, and all that is directly related to morals, is corrupt, so that man is selfish and worldly, loving himself above all, capable of only a semblance of love for others, who are regarded and affected only for the sake of himself ; and say that in some particular case the understanding, all that is receptive (or perceptive) and cogitative, is in entire harmony, in indissoluble union with the corrupt heart ; the result is a fearful and hopeless peace—nothing can be received, nothing will be believed, nothing can or will be thought which is condemnatory of the dominant evil love, and most thoroughly, most enduringly as the man thinketh in his heart, so is he.

But this is a non-existent case. The heart indeed is corrupt exceedingly ; the imagination of the thoughts of man's heart is only evil continually. But the *understanding* is Divinely maintained in such liberty, that though no man can love better than he thinks, yet any and every man can learn and think and know and intellectually approve higher principles than those which are enshrined in his heart and written in his members. Thus through the freedom of the intellect, which may receive the very light of heaven, motives and means for our reformation may be freely amassed, and in the intellect there may be born new faculties of resolve ; a

new heart can be created in the intellectual side of man's nature which in the end may and shall subdue that evil heart, which in its own nature and in its constant effort is an evil heart of unbelief. In the process of this new creation, this regeneration, every truth that is learned for use, all faith *which worketh by love*, all recognition of Divine commands which leads to their being kept, is the occasion and measure of the Divine bestowal of bounty. He who at the bidding of that perpetually abiding prophet, the Word of God, smiteth upon the ground three times, shall three times smite his spiritual foes; he who smiteth five or six times shall smite his enemy unto his final overthrow. The Divine law is, According to thy faith be it done to thee: the faithful in few things shall rule over few, the faithful in many shall be ruler over many things. This teaching is beautifully present in the institution of the Holy Supper. Because the disciples are disciples, because as they have learned they have followed, they are gathered together. Jesus takes in hand a passover cake, and, blessing, breaks it. How irregularly it breaks we know—no two pieces of like size or shape. When this is distributed, each shares differently from each. There is no accident here, there can be no accident in the hands of Him who has made the universe by number and weight and measure, and whose providence cares for the fall of a single hair, as for the death of a sparrow and for the life of man. The promise is fulfilled: the hungry are filled, the filling being the counterpart of the hunger; the measure of the one is the measure of the other. As in manna gathering, so in bread giving, whether to the thousands or to the few; he that has much has nothing over, and he that receives little has no lack. The good given is measured. And when good is given there grows new desire for truth, and truth is offered not by measure, each drinks at his own

will. Of manna there is an omer for each ; the water flows in an unailing stream, so that the pilgrim may at his pleasure drink of the brook by the way ; so shall he lift up the head.

Have we not already found the answer to the question as to worthy and unworthy communicants ? We approach a table of food, he only worthily eats what is freely offered who eats with gratitude and appetite. We approach a table of spiritual food, he only worthily takes who truly needs and desires with grateful longing the good and the true which form the feast. Men may therefore be "worthy" in divers degrees. Our daily meals, sanctified by spoken or unexpressed grace before meat, are (may we not say it ?) lowest but true forms of communion. Higher and higher forms there are, as men seek to be taught duty and to receive heavenly reward, or as they seek to know the love of charity and to receive bounty without thought of merit, or as they come to acquire the wisdom of love and to be glad in the profusion of that Divine mercy which measures its gifts only by the capacity of the receiver, and for water bestows wine *new* in the kingdom of God.

Every spiritual blessing needed or desirable is contained in the Holy Supper, which, like bread and wine, blesses us throughout, from lowest needs to highest faculties. By food and drink the physical life is renewed, the mental vigour is restored, and man is continued here that he may grow in spiritual perfection. If we distinguish man as his life is external and internal, the Supper is for the maintenance of the external life of our present conscious activity, knowledge, and experience, and also for the development of that internal life of which the Master said, "The kingdom of God is within you." We say the development, we mean in each case the opening within the worshipper, in increasing degree, of that kingdom

which (not shall be, but) is within him as the initial and constituent fact of human nature. And since man's heavenly abode hereafter is that heavenly state which is opened in him here, the Holy Supper introduces the true communicant into heaven, as baptism introduces the baptized into the Church below. Inasmuch as the heavenly character is only by degrees superinduced upon our corrupt nature, as the kingdom within is only successively, by many steps of progress, so opened within us as to become supreme in all our life, there is use in, nay, for those who understand, and who have ears to hear, there is need for, repeated communion, whereby they that worship the Father in spirit and in truth go from strength to strength, from company to company, until each appears before Jehovah in Zion. Herein is involved the visible and formal means of the growth of the Church and heaven within the individual, and consequently also of the extension of the Church as the dwelling, the tabernacle of God with men, and of the constant increase of the heavens of which we read as an innumerable company of angels, the general assembly and Church of the firstborn ones who are written in heaven, and the spirits of just men made perfect.

Seeing that these benefits are involved in the feast which constitutes the highest form in which internal worship takes to itself an external form, it is well and truly said that the Holy Supper is to worthy receivers a signature and seal that they are the sons of God ("T. C. R.," 728).

This is because the worshipper in this act comes to the Lord Himself, who is really present in His holy ordinance. We have considered that there is one wave-formed, radiant energy from the sun, however man may distinguish and divide it into heat and light; and so a man is one being, however we may mark off and set in contrast the acts

and marks of his will and his understanding, or however we may speak separately of the body, soul, and spirit as numerically distinct elements and components of human nature. So, too, the Lord is one. There shall be one Jehovah, and His name one; though we may need to be reminded of love, wisdom, and might in Him, or though we may need to be told of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Yet He is one. He that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father; the Son is that other Comforter which is not another. The Lord is one Divine Person—Divine in soul and spirit, and in body as well; and this Divine Person is the Lord Jesus Christ, who to our weakness and ignorance presents Himself under two forms in this Holy Supper. "This," said He, "is My body, and this My blood." The Lord is not divided in person or character, and His essentials have no severed or severable existence. Not His flesh apart from Him is meat, nor His blood isolated from Himself is drink indeed. The Lord Himself is really present in this sacrament. It is not merely a Jacob's ladder, whereby the worshippers may find in diverse degrees an approach to Him who is high over all, God blessed for ever. We must here bow down with reverence, perhaps at times with solemn dread, saying, "Surely Jehovah is here; and I knew it not. This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven."

There is a Real Presence in the Holy Supper, and this real presence, which constitutes its value and gives it all its significance, is not transubstantiation—the finite bread has not been created into an infinite Divine; nor is it consubstantiation—the Divine has not been superadded to the material creature. The real presence does not begin with any act of creation or transmutation during the act of worship, it has its basis in the very nature of the elements, and in the very nature of the Lord Him-

self. Men saw Jesus, a fellow-pilgrim, travel-stained, lined with care, a "Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" but all who, after the discipline of care and toil, are beside Him when they are by great affection raised far above the ordinary worldly states of their daily life, see Him transfigured before them. So we, if sorrows and trials have nurtured in us love to the Lord, *i.e.* love to all goodness, love to all truth, we in our communion may see Him with glistening raiment and with shining face, and may know Him as divinely human; and *that* not beside us, but in us, Christ formed within us the hope of glory, and indwelling with us by His love and wisdom, so that even in our daily life, whether by fasting and prayer, or by the mere word of His power, all uncleanness of spirit shall be cast out, to torment and rend us no more for ever.

W. CROSBY BARLOW, M.A.

Camberwell.

VIII.

BEFORE stating that view of the Lord's Supper, or the Eucharist, which we hold to be the only one in harmony with the various references to it in the Scriptures, I desire to notice some matters in the contributions of Dr. Smith and Dr. David Brown. In Dr. Smith's paper there is no reference whatsoever to the denial of the cup to the laity in the Churches in communion with the See of Rome. I refer to this at the outset, for if the arguments for the Real Presence logically involved transubstantiation (which they are very far from doing), I should be more unable than ever to submit to the claims of His Church: for the more intimate the connection between the body and blood of Christ and the consecrated elements, the more unjustifiable it is to withhold from any communicant that which is assumed to have become His blood, seeing that the Master has said, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, *and* drink His blood;" and seeing that He instituted the Sacrament in the words, "Drink ye all of it, for this is My blood."

The doctrine of concomitancy, or that the blood is received in the body, is absolutely contrary to the root-idea of this sacrament, which is the sacrament of a death; for the body and blood are not united as in life, but separated as in death.

I never read words more lucidly setting forth the separate necessity of partaking of the cup than those of Dr. Smith himself. "In the figure (Exod. xxiv. 8), the

blood of the victim was sprinkled externally on the people; or, at the Passover, on the doorposts of the house where they were assembled. But in the fulfilment, the blood of the Redeemer was to penetrate the inmost recesses of our being, and hence was given to the apostles to drink." But if it was given to the apostles on such a ground, surely it should be given to all, for all, equally with the Apostles, need the penetrating power of the Divine blood. I shall take notice of Dr. Smith's remarks respecting transubstantiation further on.

Dr. Brown writes (p. 202), "Since then to bring to remembrance the glorious object there set forth is the one specified design of the Lord's Supper, this, beyond all dispute, must be held to be the fundamental and dominating idea of it." But we have to notice an astonishing omission in all that Dr. Brown writes on this subject; arising from an entire unconsciousness of what is involved in the question. To whom, or before whom, is the memorial made? This is a vital question, for it involves no less than this, "Is the Eucharist an act done towards God, or an act done towards men?—an act of worship, or an act of instruction?"

If it be an act done towards God, with the view of making before the Father the memorial which the Eternal Son instituted, then any memorializing of men, or of ourselves, which may be in it, sinks into insignificance.

The Catholic Church in all its branches, Greek, Roman, Egyptian, Indian, Anglican, American,—even the ancient schismatical bodies, such as the Monophysites,—have always held the act to be "towards God;" for the account of the institution, and the memorial words recounting the great acts of redemption, have always been recited, not in an address to the people, but in a prayer to God.

On this the whole conception of the Eucharist as a sacrifice really depends, for a sacrifice is an act of wor-

ship, and the Eucharist in its root-idea must be accounted an act of worship before it can be realized as a sacrifice.

If the reader care to do so, he will find this view of the Eucharistic memorial as primarily made to God the Father in a work, "The Christian Sacrifice," by Mede, a divine who, in his prophetic views, is as antipapal as the most earnest ultra-Protestant can desire. I give two short extracts. "But the commemoration is to be made to God His Father, and is not a bare remembrance, or putting ourselves in mind only (as is commonly supposed), but a putting of God in mind, for every sacrifice is directed unto God, and the oblation therein, whatever it be, hath Him for its object, and not man."

Again, "The mystery of which rite they (the Fathers) took to be this, that as Christ by presenting His death and satisfaction to His Father continually intercedes for us in heaven; so the Church on earth semblably approaches the throne of grace by representing Christ unto His Father in these holy mysteries of His death and passion."

This setting forth before the Father the passion of His Son is very well expressed in the remarkable hymn of Wesley, quoted by Dr. Littledale (pp. 23, 24). Again, Dr. Brown writes (p. 46): "Instead of a sacrifice, we have a feast upon a sacrifice, a vastly different thing: a feast, too, not laid upon an altar, but spread upon a table;" but does not Dr. Brown see at a glance how directly this goes to prove the Real Presence? for the feast upon a sacrifice was not a feast upon any creature killed anywhere, or anyhow, but a feast upon a victim which had been killed at the door of the tabernacle, and its blood sprinkled at the altar; so that the analogy would lead us to believe that, if Holy Communion be a feast upon a sacrifice, it must be a feast on the very body of the sacrificed victim.

When men set this "feast upon a sacrifice" against

"the sacrifice," as if the one were separate from the other, they seem to show that they have never read with any attention the directions given by God for the offering of sacrifices (Lev. i.-iv.) For a sacrifice (burnt-offering, peace-offering, sin-offering, etc.) was not a simple, but a compound, thing, having four distinct parts, each necessary, and two of them at least comprehending or assuming the whole.

1. There was the offering of the victim, by the offerer laying his hands upon it at the door of the tabernacle. This indicated that it was of His own free will, and that it was to be treated so as to make atonement for him.

2. There was the mactation or slaughter. This was in order that the blood, the one atoning thing (Lev. xvii. 11), might be poured forth in death.

3. There was the presentation of the blood by sprinkling, usually at the foot of the altar, but, in the case of the sin-offering, before the veil as well (Lev. iv. 5, 6), and in the case of the offering on the great day of atonement, within the veil (Lev. xvi. 14). This was by far the most religious part of the whole ceremony. It was the peculiar function of the priest, and it was essential for all atoning purposes, for it made the slaughter of the victim a religious act. For the Jews were expressly commanded after they had slain any animal in the ordinary way (or even in hunting) for common food, to pour out its blood on the earth (Lev. xvii. 12, 13; Deut. xii. 15, 16); and so the sprinkling of the blood at the foot of the altar converted what would otherwise have been the mere slaughter of a creature for human food into the most solemn of religious acts of worship.

4. Fourthly, there was the consumption. Here the altar itself came into use; but not as the thing on which the creature was slain, as is almost universally, but most ignorantly, assumed, but as a table—the Lord's table

(Ezek. xli. 22; xliv. 15, 16; Mal. i. 7, 12). That which was consumed upon it by fire was the bread of God (Lev. xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21).

When then the worshippers partook of that food, some of which was consumed on the altar, they fed on God's food from God's table in token of reconciliation; the atonement wrought by the previous slaughter and sprinkling of blood being thus applied and sealed. So that it is absurd to speak of the Eucharist not being a sacrifice because it is the feast on a victim. If the term sacrifice was rigidly confined to the slaughter this might be true, but so far from this being the case, the slaying was only one of the essential parts, and not *per se* the most religious. In the bread-offering, or Mincha, the peculiar type of the Eucharist, it was of course always absent.

I shall now proceed to show the theory or conception of the Eucharist as set forth in the Scriptures, and in the worship of the Church.

1. It was in the foreknowledge of the ever-blessed Trinity that the second Person in that Trinity should assume the nature of a creature, and in that nature reconcile all things to God by His submission to death.

The world on which we live was to be the place of this act of reconciliation, and the race of mankind was to furnish the nature of flesh and blood which the Son of God was to assume, in order that His body and blood might be separated in death.

Man having fallen from God could not offer to God the worship of an unfallen creature, so it pleased God to ordain in the very first family a mode of access to Himself, wholly grounded on that reconciling act of self-surrender which the Eternal Son was to perform.

This mode of access was sacrifice. As ordained for the use of the Jews, it was the slaughter of a clean domestic animal, the pouring out of its blood at the

bottom of an altar, the burning of a part as surrendered to God, and the consumption of a part by the worshippers.

This sacrificial mode of access was full of significance. It set before God the sacrifice which His Son would offer ; it reminded the worshipper of the guilt of sin which required atonement by blood ; it betokened reconciliation to God, inasmuch as they partook of food from His table ; it also betokened amity among the worshippers, inasmuch as they partook of the same food, and worshipped together. It pleased God to confine the offering of these sacrifices to one family, and to one place. It pleased God to reveal, through certain utterances of His prophets, that in due time the atoning or reconciling virtue of these sacrifices would be centred in an atonement or reconciliation, to be made by that Messiah whom the Jews in all ages had been led to look for.

It pleased God, through certain utterances of the same prophets, to set forth that the purer worship of the times of this Messiah would be, in some true sense, a sacrificial worship ; and so able to be described under sacrificial images. Thus Jer. xxxiii. 17 : " Thus saith the Lord ; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel ; neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually."

Also (Mal. i. 11), a place extensively referred to by the oldest Fathers, as fulfilled in Christian Eucharistic worship : " From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering," *i.e.*, a pure mincha, or bread-offering.

It pleased God also to declare prophetically that the priesthood of the Messiah should be exercised at God's

right hand (Psalm cx. 1, 4) ; that His priesthood should be an unchangeable priesthood, not after the manner of Aaron, but of an older priest, a kingly priest, who was far greater than Aaron's greatest ancestor (Heb. vii. 6, 7) ; the exercise of whose priesthood was connected with the bringing forth of bread and wine.

In the fulness of the times the Eternal Word was manifest in the flesh. He came not as a spirit to enlighten or renew men's spirits by purely spiritual action, as the Holy Spirit does ; but to reconcile all men to God in one body on the cross ; to open to men a new and living way of access through His flesh ; and to give His flesh to be their bread. These purposes of His coming have to do with that part of His nature which is outward and fleshly, as well as with that which is inward and spiritual.

A few hours before His sacrifice, our Melchizedec, after the example of him who had gone before Him, brought forth bread and wine. He spake of this bread and wine in terms alike mysterious and sacrificial.

He spake of the bread as His body, given and broken in sacrifice ; and of the cup as His blood shed in sacrifice for atonement ; and as by blood sacrificially shed the old covenant was ratified, so by His blood sacrificially shed the new covenant was to be ratified. Besides this, He used with reference to the intent of the whole Eucharistic action a word used in the Septuagint and in the New Testament only with a sacrificial import, in that He said : " Do this for my remembrance "—or *anamnesis*. This word occurs only once besides in the New Testament ; in Heb. x. 3, in which place it refers to the sacrifices of the great day of atonement. " In these sacrifices there is *anamnesis* of sins made every year," and of course before God, to whom alone sacrifices are offered. It occurs twice in the Old Testament (Septuagint) ; once in

Numb. x. 10, where it is expressly said of certain sacrifices that they are to be an anamnesis before God ; but above all in Lev. xxiv. 7, where with reference to the shew-bread and the incense upon it, it is said, "That it may be on the bread for a memorial (or anamnesis), even an offering made by fire unto the Lord."

In connection with all this He used the word *ποιεῖτε*, a word which by itself need not be sacrificial, but when used with such a word as anamnesis, and with reference to the ratifying blood of a covenant, assuredly is. Immediately upon this, the events which ended in His crucifixion a few hours after followed one upon another with fearful rapidity. Then the all-atoning Victim surrendered His life, having witnessed to the all-sufficiency of His sufferings in the words, "It is finished."

Now what was finished? The whole work of atonement, in so far as it consisted in the endurance of pain, and death, and anguish ; the contempt, the reproaches, the mockings, the scourgings, the piercing of the thorns and of the nails—all were over ! But was the great sacrificial act considered as a whole done and finished ? No ; for if our Lord's sacrifice was set forth by the God-ordained typical sacrifices, the two parts of it which we should look for as corresponding to the presentation of the blood in the Holiest, and the consumption of the body by the worshippers, were as yet in the future.

Now, if there was to be a true analogy between the typical shadows and the great antitypal Reality, there must be, in the latter, some heavenly and transcendental act of "entering into the Holiest by His own blood" (Heb. ix. 12).

And so there was to be, for that which is revealed as having taken place in heaven could not come to pass till His ascension. Not till then could our High Priest enter into the Holy Place with His own blood. And the

sacrifice was not yet partaken of by being eaten, as the peace-offerings and the Passover were required to be. "The event on Calvary was at the time hidden from the comprehension of men; the offering was dishonoured, without partakers, without public testimony to its dignity and worth." * So that if the great sacrifice corresponded to its types, two parts had yet to be accomplished when the Victim surrendered His spirit. His blood had to be presented in the Holiest, and His sacrificial body had to be partaken of. The first of these took place in heaven. There our High Priest entered in once with His own blood, and in a vision vouchsafed to St. John, He is again set forth under sacrificial emblems. He appears as "the Lamb standing as slain;" the Lamb "standing," and so living, and, as priests do, standing to mediate; and yet "slain," so that there is, as it were, a mystery of life and death united in the heaven of heavens.

What the reality is which underlies these two things—this "entrance with His own blood," and this standing as "alive" and yet "slain," we know not; only we know that He is a priest now, after the manner of Melchizedec—that as His Priesthood is unchangeable, He must be exercising His priesthood now; so consequently, as it enters into the first conception of priests that they offer something, He also, being a Priest *now*, must have somewhat *now* to offer—that this offering must be Himself, not in the way of pain and death, but as alive, and the Head of His Church; so that in the presentation of Himself, He presents His Church with the sufferings, the self-denials, the labours, the obedience, the devotions of each and all its members; and yet withal this He is pleading and mediating through the exhibition of His past death, under the figure of death in life, life in death.

* Dollinger.

One essential part of the sacrificial act yet remains, that under which all was included, and by which all was applied. The Victim had to be partaken of as food. Now Christ provided the means for this. The cup of blessing was to be the perpetual participation in His blood, the broken bread was to be the perpetual participation in His body; the whole action was to be His anamnesis. By it the Church was evermore to celebrate His death. By it she was evermore to be fed by His body and blood.

In the very first notice of the Church after the Ascension, the account of the Pentecostal Church (Acts ii. 42), this ordinance called "the breaking of bread" assumes the first place: of four marks of the Church it is one. It is put side by side, as on a par, with doctrine, fellowship, and the prayers.

This breaking of bread, as so leading a feature of apostolic Christianity, is only natural, if it was designed to be the one thing which took the place of all the ancient sacrifices, that is, in fact, of the ancient public worship.

Whatever the ancient Jewish sacrifices did for the ancient Church as regards its common or Church access to God, this the Eucharist must do for the Church of Christ. It will be well to see to the principle on which this can be,

Before Christ offered up His life, God was worshipped by the sacrifice of innumerable lives. There were as many lives surrendered as there were victims offered. This multiplicity of offerings of lives showed that the One all-atoning Life had not yet been given. It was necessary that any rite which should supersede the old sacrifices should betoken, and in some sort be identified with, the surrender of this One Life.

To this end the Son of God ordained a sacrament which

was to be to the mactation or immolation on Calvary what the presentation of its blood and the consumption of its flesh was to each single separate victim of the ancient ritual.

The bread and the cup were, by the words of institution, so identified with the body and blood of the all-atoning Victim, that the sacrifice on Calvary was everywhere sacrificially presented and partaken of. So that, instead of the consumption being confined to one altar, "the pure offering," as Malachi had foretold, was presented and partaken of in every place where the institution was fulfilled.

Thus the Eucharist is a most wonderful provision to unite the universal Church outwardly as well as inwardly, in outward form as well as in spiritual reality, with the one sacrifice ; so that the representation of that sacrifice should be, as seems becoming, the worship of the Church, the bond of its union with its Head, *and* with all its members, the outward expression of its highest doctrine, and the spiritual food and sustenance of its individual children. Nothing then can be more ignorant than the allegation that they who hold the Eucharistic sacrifice in the slightest degree detract from the all-sufficiency of that on Calvary, much less that they attempt to repeat it.* On the contrary, in the most solemn manner, we

* Dr. de Pressensé begins his paper with the question, "Ought we to regard the Communion as the Catholics do, as a repetition of the redeeming sacrifice?" But has Dr. de Pressensé ever considered that no one in his senses could ever dream of the Eucharist or anything else being an actual repetition of the *death* on the cross ; without which, of course, it could be no repetition of the sacrifice ? You might much sooner believe that the whole universe was annihilated and re-created, than that the act on Calvary was repeated. It is quite conceivable that God should destroy and renew all things. It is inconceivable that He should cause Christ to suffer over again. We must suppose that Dr. de Pressensé

reaffirm it, in that we perform that part of the one Divine sacrificial function which testifies to the completeness and acceptance on God's part of all that has gone before, and unite ourselves with that showing forth of His death which Christ is now making in heaven.

We have no circumstantial account of the celebration of the Eucharist in the New Testament. What is the significance of this omission? On principles of common sense it seems to imply that we are to look to the practice of the ages nearest to the first age, for the mind of the Spirit on this matter. Anyhow we are not to regard a mode of celebration, which first appeared in the Church as a totally new thing fifteen hundred years after the original institution, as our rule for our practice in this matter.

The Eucharist being a public outward rite, must have, of necessity, some outward form or rule for its celebration.

Allowing most freely that this form has differed materially in some of its minor details, still there must have been some principle to guide the Church as to the mode of observing the great institution of the gospel.

Now there have been two such principles: one which holds the Eucharist to be in some sense a sacrificial act of worship; the other which holds it to be a memorial meal, and not fundamentally an act of worship, much less a sacrifice in any sense.

In the first of these, amidst many diversities of detail, there have ever been several features in common in all Eucharistic services, and amongst these there has been one which the united voice and uniform practice of the Church has declared to be the one essential feature; and

confounds repetition with representation. Repetition is simply unimaginable. Representation is inherent in the first conception of the sacrament; though men may attach different degrees to it; some thinking it to be before God—some to men only.

this is a form identical with that of our consecration prayer, in which the elements are blessed in a prayer said over them ; in which prayer is recited the original act of institution which our Lord celebrated on the night of His betrayal, as well as the sufferings and death with which that act of institution was immediately followed.

This is the very heart and centre of the Catholic form, and, being an act of worship, is of course addressed to God. Such an act, being the memorial or commemoration of the great redeeming sacrifice, is *the* act of Christian worship. The rule of its celebration was at least weekly, if not daily. The account of Pentecostal Christianity points to its being as continuous as public prayers, which we know were daily. In the time of Justyn Martyr the whole Church met every Lord's day to receive it.

About fifteen hundred years and more after this form had prevailed, a revolution was inaugurated amongst certain of the Reformed Bodies in the matter of the whole theory and practice of Christian worship. The Eucharist was removed from its position as the dominant act of Christian worship, and its administration became only occasional. Everything was done to prevent men from looking upon it, not merely as a sacrifice, but as an act of worship at all. The consecration prayer, in which takes place the recital before God of the act of institution by Christ, was abolished, and the place of the gospel, in which that act of institution was contained, was ordered to be expounded to the people only. The form of this mode of administration (celebration it can hardly be called), the point of departure from which the new state of things amongst the ultra-Protestant bodies may be said to have started, is to be found in Calvin's "Manner of Celebrating the Lord's Supper," in the second volume of his tracts (Calvin Society's Translation, vol. ii., p. 119).

Not one single direction for prayer is given from beginning to end. The only allusion to worship at all is the permission to sing some psalms. The whole is treated as if it were an act of instruction ; and as far as I can see, nothing else.

The place and position of the Eucharist as the stated worship of the Church on the Lord's Day, was superseded by a form of service as unlike it as possible. The presiding minister is directed to read a prayer from a service book, or to offer up an extempore prayer, with reading of Scripture, psalms, and a sermon. The prayer being in most cases left as to its ideas and language to the discretion of the minister, need have no reference to the sacrifice of Christ, much less to the sacrament of His body. In fact, owing to the lapse of so many of the Continental Protestant bodies into Socinianism, all reference amongst such bodies to the expiatory nature of that sacrifice is excluded.

Now the intimations of the Eucharist in the Word of God, as to what it is, what it supersedes,* what it feeds

* There are three or four intimations in the New Testament respecting Christian worship which imply a worship which it is proper to call sacrificial. They do not of themselves, perhaps, prove it to be so, but they are not reconcilable with any other idea of worship.

1. Our Lord in the words, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar," etc. (Matt. v. 23), implies that there would be, in His religion, something which could be called an altar, which is certainly a different thing from either a pulpit or a prayer-desk. He must have foreseen that the discourse He was then preaching would be for all times and ages of the Church. If then He held the same mind respecting altar worship which some do, would He have used such an illustration ?

2. In Acts xiii. 2, the word translated "ministered" to the Lord, is the very one used both in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the Septuagint to denote the altar worship of the Jewish priests. In Heb. x. it is the word translated by "ministering" in the passage--

us with, and what it unites us to, naturally issue in the conception which the Church has ever had of it, and the mode in which she has ever celebrated it, and are totally incompatible with, and never could have developed into,

“daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices.” It may be said of this expression also, that the inspired writer would not have used it if sacrificial terms and ideas applied to Christian worship were abhorrent to the mind of the Spirit.

3. Again, in 1 Cor. x. 18-22, the table of the Lord is paralleled with the table of devils—or of the heathen gods. Now the tables of the heathen gods were “altars,” not because the sacrifices were slain upon them, but because men partook as a rite of worship of the food which had been laid upon them, and so were accounted to feast with the gods; and so the Lord’s table in the Christian Church has a similar use, and so, no matter by what name it is called, is a similar thing, a thing in all respects corresponding.

4. And this leads us to see that the altar mentioned in Heb. xiii. 10, in the words, “We have an altar,” must be the Christian Lord’s table. If the altar be that part of the sacrificial furniture from which the victim was partaken of (and the terms altar and table are in Ezekiel and Malachi interchangeable); then we Christians *have* an altar, because we have that thing by partaking of which we are enabled to eat of the sacrifice of Christ (1 Cor. x. 15-18). And the whole context, before and after, closely agrees with this. The unbelieving Jews had “meats” which could not establish the heart. We, on the contrary, have an altar from which we receive heavenly food, which, if faithfully partaken of, does establish the heart with grace. Unbelieving Jews (those who are typified by those who serve the tabernacle), have no right to eat the food of this altar; they must first believe, and depart from their doomed camp, bearing the reproach of Christ. Their exclusion, whilst in their present state, from our altar, is typified by the fact that their greatest sin offering of all—that of the great day of atonement, the blood of which alone is brought into the Most Holy Place—could not be eaten even by the ministering priests. But of this, our sin-offering, every Christian partakes.

5. Sacrificial worship and its accessories (altars, censers, incense), are throughout the Book of the Revelation used to describe the worship of heaven. This could not be if they are abominable in God’s sight.

the Zwinglian or Calvinistic form of either doctrine or celebration.

The prophecies of Messianic worship as being sacrificial, which we have noticed, never could be fulfilled by the ordinary worship of non-Catholic bodies—a minister uttering an extemporary prayer accompanied with psalms or hymns, or reading of Scripture and sermons; in fact by synagogue-worship. Such worship may be very good in its way, but it never could be the fulfilment of such prophecies as those of Jeremiah or Malachi.

But if the Eucharistic celebration, in accordance with that type of it which prevailed from the very first in all branches of the Church, be the Divinely-ordained act of worship, then everything is explained, everything falls into its place, everything coheres in one system. Such sacramental worship naturally takes the place of the old sacrifices. It naturally sets forth the continuity of principle between the old and new worship in that in both the one all-sufficient Sacrifice is publicly and visibly set forth and honoured by the leading act of worship. It naturally asserts itself to be the fulfilment of the old prophecies respecting the worship of the Church. It naturally gives to the sacrifice on the cross a means for its earthly presentation; the desired opportunity of representing, under the earthly forms of the earthly Melchizedec, the great heavenly and spiritual act of the Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec. It naturally affords the Church the means she wants of feeding on the Divine Victim, under the forms He has Himself set forth.

II. We have now to consider the Eucharist as the means ordained by Christ whereby we may be fed with that heavenly food, without which He solemnly tells us we cannot have His life in us.

All that we have said is the necessary preliminary to

the right understanding of this ; for the food offered to us is no other than the food of the sacrifice ; the eating and drinking is part of the one great sacrificial act. We eat and drink, not the food of a common feast, but of a sacrifice—that which was sacrificially slain, and is now both in heaven and on earth, though under different forms, sacrificially presented ; for “we have an altar”—not a festive board, but an altar—and what we eat and drink is from that altar. The body which we eat, and the blood which we drink, are the body and blood of a Victim. God has thus joined in a most mysterious but most blessed way our highest worship and our Divinest nourishment. In the words of the 22nd Psalm, that of all other most prophetic of the cross, “The poor shall eat and be satisfied,” and “all they that be fat upon earth have eaten and worshipped.”

The associations of the Feast are not only joy and gladness, but very bitter suffering and death, “With bitter herbs shall ye eat it.” We receive life in showing forth death. We feast under the cross. Would that in speaking of such a feast we could avoid all controversy. Would that we could leave such questions as, “What do we receive ? and how do we receive it ?” as Dr. Luthardt has left them. “Inasmuch as we live in a body of sin and death in this sinful and feeble human nature, we receive the Lord’s body and blood, that we may have therein a real and bodily pledge of our twofold salvation, forgiveness, and glorification.”

But the words of Christ in instituting the Communion in terms not taken from the spiritual, but from the material, world, must be vindicated ; for men have made them void. They have so interpreted them as if it would have been much nearer the truth for Him to have said, “Except ye receive my Spirit,” than for Him to have said, “Except ye eat my flesh.” We must show that it is

neither right nor safe to explain away the mystery of His words by making them contain no mystery at all; by interpreting them of the most ordinary spiritual acts, such as realizing His atonement. We must show why we cannot understand His words as if they required us to receive figures or emblems, which we, by an act of devout imagination, turn into what they are not.

The doctrine of the ancient Church, grounded on the express words of Christ, is, that the body and blood of Christ are present in the consecrated elements by a mode of presence which is unique; and so is, and can only be called, sacramental—so that the elements after consecration have two parts, the outward part or sign, and the inward part; each part being present in its integrity. This is a Real Presence, a presence real and effective for all purposes, for which God wills that that body and blood should be given to us. It is a Real Presence of body and blood, not of mere spirit and influence. The presence is what is called objective, *i.e.*, it is brought about by the blessing or consecration, not within our hearts only, by an act of faith in the atonement.

The faith within us enables us to discern the presence, and to be fed to life eternal by what we receive; but so far as is revealed our faith does not make the presence.

Now this sacramental presence must ever be a mystery. It cannot be apprehended by our intellects, so that we who hold it are in some respects at a disadvantage compared with those who hold that by a miracle God annihilates the substance of bread, and substitutes the body of His Son in its place; or with those who hold that the presence is only that of a picture or image which may excite good and holy thoughts, but is rather a pledge of the absence than of the presence of the reality.

The necessity which we believe to be laid upon all Christians for believing in this sacramental presence is

this:—"Our Lord declares the necessity for our eating His flesh and drinking His blood in His discourse in Capernaum. Of this, He, at the time, vouchsafed no explanation. Those who heard it received the words in a literal as distinguished from a figurative sense. If they had received them in a figurative sense, they would not have left Him, but would have considered that He spake in parables, which was the leading characteristic of His teaching. When the seemingly literal sense drove them from Him, He refused to give the one word of explanation which would have satisfied those whose Scriptures and whose ritual were so full of figures and typical meanings. If then He could have given them any explanation which would have removed the difficulty respecting their eating His flesh, He would have done so in mercy to them, but He did not; evidently showing by this that the matter cannot be taken out of the region of mystery or of difficulty, or indeed of the supernatural in its highest conceivable form. Shortly after this He used the same words when He gave them His Supper or Communion. In instituting the Eucharist in the same words betokening the giving and receiving of "body" and "blood," He offers His disciples the means by which they might receive what He had before promised. If the Lord's Supper be the means for receiving the food promised in John vi., then all is clear. The promise, and the means for receiving the promise, the necessity for eating and drinking, and the food offered to be received, are in the same terms—terms unique in God's Word. If it be not so, then we have this astonishing twofold difficulty. We have a discourse full of extraordinary promises without any means of receiving them in the terms in which they are made; and we have a rite or sacrament ordained in equally extraordinary terms, with no instruction given to the receivers by which they might intelligently or faith-

fully receive. But again (and this is to me still more suggestive of the direction in which we are to look for the true view), Christ commissioned His servant St. Paul to give some very direct and definite teaching respecting the Eucharist. Now it was the especial commission of this Apostle to assert the claims of a spiritual system, as against a carnal one. This was the battle of his life. If then the Eucharistic symbols are to be so spiritualized in their significance that "body" and "blood" in any real sense are to have no place in them, here was the teacher from whom, above all others, we should have looked for such a view.

But, on the contrary, we find that this Apostle intensifies sacramental teaching rather than otherwise. He speaks of the cup and the bread being the partaking of the Lord's blood, and of His body. He makes the fact of the body and blood being there enhance the guilt of those who by not discerning it, or receiving it unworthily, profaned it.

So that wherever in God's Word the Holy Communion is mentioned, it is mentioned as the sacrament of "body" and "blood," not of internal faith or of purely spiritual instruction and emotion, but of "body" and "blood." Every notice of it is in one direction, *i. e.*, in what we should call the High, or the sacramental, direction. My belief then in the Real Presence is intimately bound up with my belief in our Lord's Godhead, or at least in His perfect Divine foreknowledge.

For when He said, "My flesh is meat indeed," or when He said, "This is my body," His eye glanced down the ages. He saw how that from the first His Church would take His words as literally as possible.* He fore-

* By "as literally as possible" I mean so far as to preserve to all His words their due significance. When He calls after blessing it the contents of the cup "this fruit of the vine," we understand

saw how in this matter His Church would appeal to His words, and His alone; how she would appeal to no tradition, no council, no authority whatsoever, but to His words of institution only.

If then anything like the Zwinglian or even the Calvinistic view were according to His mind, why was it that His own words and those of His servant led men in exactly the contrary direction?

The Church from the apostolic times has been unanimous in believing that in His Communion He designed to give men His body as a means not only to the eternal life of their souls, but also of their bodies. She has believed that He designed to give men, in a heavenly and spiritual way, not His Spirit, but His body. In other means of grace (as in reading the Scriptures, or hearing sermons, or in laying on of hands), He infuses into them His Spirit; here He meant to give them His body. Not a figure or emblem of His body as absent, but a sacramental sign to assure men of its presence.

It is incredible then that if our Lord intended by "body" and "blood" only to express figures—figures which, no matter how we clothe them with high evangelical phrases, are only figures, suggestive to the pious imagination of what is really absent—He should have so expressed Himself that the best and purest ages

His words literally when we assert that the contents of the cup, *i. e.*, wine, remains in its natural substance after consecration. Again, when St. Paul says: "Whosoever shall eat this bread unworthily," or "as often as ye eat this bread . . . ye do show forth the Lord's death," he speaks of the consecrated bread as bread. This a believer in transubstantiation would be careful not to do. So that it is a great mistake to suppose that by transubstantiation men take the words of Christ or His apostles uniformly in their literal sense. Of some words they assert an exaggerated literal sense; of others in the same context they reject the literal sense altogether.

of the Church should have so grievously misapprehended His meaning. We cannot better illustrate this than by comparing the stream of Eucharistic doctrine, held in its integrity from the very first, with the later development of certain erroneous doctrines to which certain portions of the Church have committed themselves. Take Mariolatry, for instance. Those who have fostered it have had no single word of Christ to appeal to. They have appealed to sentiment, to late tradition, to apocryphal writings, to misapplied logic, to unwarranted inferences. Look at the relations between such words as, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother," and the Mariolatry which rose absolutely in spite of them, and such words as, "This is my body," and the sacramental presence which holy men from St. Paul downwards have derived directly from it.

The whole matter is a matter of the interpretation of certain words of Christ; are they to be understood as if they held forth a figure of what is really absent, or a sign of what is really present? In the ages when to be a Christian was to be in perpetual danger of death by torture; when there were no centuries of tradition, Catholic or Protestant, to overlay apostolical teaching; when by faith in Christ was meant adoring acceptance of His every word, as if He actually were "God manifest in the flesh"—in these ages, I say, by writers who by their every word evince that they are taught by the Spirit of God, these words of Christ were always taken literally; literally, not as implying transubstantiation, but in what we call a sacrament alway, *i.e.*, a way in which we acknowledge two parts in the sacrament, an outward and an inward, and we preserve throughout to both these parts their realities.

Now we of the Church of England are pledged to this

sacramental way of understanding these words of Christ. We have to teach our children that the sacrament has two parts, an outward and an inward part; that the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper is bread and wine, and that the inward part or thing signified is "the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." With this agree the prayers in our Eucharistic service, and our article. We pray in the prayer just before consecration that we may "so eat the flesh of God's dear Son Jesus Christ, and drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us."

In these words of this most solemn prayer we connect the reception of the blessing promised in John vi. with the reception of Holy Communion; for in that discourse Christ said: "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him." In the prayer of consecration itself, we pray that "we receiving these creatures of bread and wine according to our Saviour Christ's holy institution in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood." And in the article on the Lord's Supper the words of St. Paul are reproduced, in that it is said that "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ."

All these statements (and several others) involve the sacramental mystery (of the co-existence in the sacrament of the outward and inward part), as distinguished from the sacramental miracle of transubstantiation, and the mere emblematical exhibition of what is really absent.

We thank God that He has, by a marvellous provi-

dence, led the Church of England to a way of taking the words of Christ which is most likely to be nearest to the truth, for it is that which was taken by the earliest saints and martyrs. The earliest writer who most clearly sets forth the two sides of the sacramental mystery is St. Irenæus, who belonged to the second generation after that which had seen St. John. His exposition is absolutely identical in theory or idea with that of our Church Catechism, and this is the more remarkable as there is not a word in common between the two. He is led to consider the opinions of certain heretics who denied the resurrection of the body, and he refers them to the twofold nature of the Eucharist. "But our meaning is in harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist again confirms our meaning. And we offer to Him His own, carefully teaching the communication and union, and confessing the resurrection of the flesh and spirit. For as the bread from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer perishable, having the hope of the resurrection of life everlasting" (Book IV. ch. xviii. sec. 5).

I could give, if space did not fail me, a passage from Justin Martyr of similar import ("Apology," 65, 66), and one from Cyprian very distinctly recognizing that the contents of the chalice after consecration remain in their own natural substances ("Epistle," 63).

Similarly, St. Chrysostom: "For as we call the bread before it is sanctified, bread, but when Divine grace has, through the intervention of the priest, sanctified it, it is set free from the name bread, and thought worthy to be called the Lord's body, although the nature of bread remains, and we proclaim not two bodies, but the one

body of the Son, so here too, the Divine nature having come to indwell in the body, they have together formed one Son, one Person " ("Epistle to Cæsarius," quoted in notes to Pusey on Real Presence, p. 85).

Similarly, Theodoret: "For neither after the consecration do the mystic symbols depart from their own nature. For they remain in their former substance, and figure, and form, and can be seen and touched as before, but in thought they are conceived, and believed, and adored, as being those things which are believed" ("Dial. 2," quoted in notes to Pusey on Real Presence, p. 87). Augustine has many places of similar import, implying that both parts preserve their reality. "What you see is bread and the cup. But as your faith requires, the bread is Christ's body, the cup His blood. How is the bread His body, and the wine His blood? These things, brethren, are therefore called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another understood. What appears has a bodily form; what is understood has a spiritual fruit" ("Serm. 272"; tom. v. p. 11, p. 1103, quoted in Bishop Harold Brown on Article XXVIII.)

Lastly Gelasius, a Bishop of Rome, and so one for whom infallibility is claimed: "The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ which we receive is a Divine thing; wherefore we also are by the same made partakers of the Divine nature, and yet the substance of bread and wine ceaseth not to be" ("De daubus in Christo Naturis," quoted in Pusey, notes, p. 88). I cite these Fathers not as authorities, but as witnesses to what was held from the first. All these—indeed all the Fathers—express themselves at times in very exalted language respecting the identity of the consecrated elements with the holy things which they represent and convey; but this identity is not an identity by way of transubstantiation any more than it is a mere figurative

identity. When it comes in their way (which owing to there being no controversy respecting the Real Presence in those days it seldom does) to recognize the outward part *per se*, they do recognize it. They assert its existence after consecration, and deny categorically its annihilation. We have then in these utterances a testimony to the faith of the best and purest times. No one, unless he has read extensively the literature of these ages, can have any idea of its unanimity in favour of the Real Presence. In fact, to use the words of Mr. Beet, "To the eye of faith the symbols disappear, and the infinite and amazing reality remains." Dr. Brown accounts for the strong opinions of the first centuries by asserting that the writers of these times "first confounded the sign with the thing signified, and then identified it;" but this is the last thing which can be laid to their charge, for if ever men saw Christ in everything they did. All their predilections would lead them to regard the Eucharistic symbols as types; but instead of this they regarded them as antitypes: and they give us their reason; which reason really comes to this, that they fully realized the Godhead of Christ, and so the Divine wisdom, the foresight, the power and grace of His every word.

To characterize them as persons of "unspiritual minds, tending to externalize what is most spiritual in Divine truth," seems monstrous to any one who is acquainted with their lives as well as with their writings. We may retort on their behalf: "If any man (Dr. A. or Dr. B.) trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's so are Irenæus and Augustine Christ's."

We assert then the deep sacramental mystery set forth in these words of Christ. We are alive to every other meaning which has been suggested. We perfectly dis-

tinguish between types and antitypes, figures and the things which they figure. We are acquainted with all such theories as the virtual presence or virtual feeding. And besides all this we realize to the fullest that Christ must be fed upon by faith internally, by the mind and heart as well as in the sacrament : we may say that this must be before He can be effectually fed upon in the sacrament. This is admirably expressed by Dr. Smith, in the words (page 76) : "The bread of life is to be given to those only who are already numbered in the category of the living, not of course to impart the first breath of life, but to preserve, and nourish, and increase the vitality that exists, and to develop it into life everlasting."

Realizing and acknowledging all this, we believe that Jesus Christ, God and man, in ordaining His Sacraments in words pertaining to, and offering to us, His lower nature of flesh and blood rather than His mind and Spirit, knew what He was doing ; knew perfectly well how His words would be understood from the first ; knew perfectly well that for fifteen hundred years they would be taken as if in this ordinance He offered to us His flesh and blood rather than His mind and Spirit, so that whatever benefits we receive, or are assured of, in this ordinance we receive through His body and blood. Is it a refreshing ordinance ? God refreshes us in it with His Son's body and blood. Is it a "sigillative or sealing ordinance" ? God seals us in it with His Son's body and blood. Is it an "incorporative" ordinance ? It is because God, by making us partakers of the sacramental body, unites us in the mystical body.

We believe then that in using these terms of "body" and "blood," Christ had in view the supply of some of the deepest needs of our compound nature, our nature of flesh and blood, as well as of soul and spirit. Our bodies

as well as our souls have to be preserved to everlasting life. Not only in mind and spirit, in heart and will, is He to be united to us and we to Him, but in our lower and outward nature also, or St. Paul would not have written, "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (Ephes. vi. 30-33). St. Paul describes it as not only the union of soul with soul, mind with mind, will with will, but of flesh with flesh, of Eve with Adam—Eve who was literally formed out of the flesh of Adam. "They two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church."

It only remains for me to say a word or two respecting some matters in the various contributions; and first respecting Dr. Smith's illustration of the supposed necessity which lies upon those who believe in the real or Sacramental presence to accept transubstantiation as well.

He uses an illustration employed by Cardinal Franzelin, which is this: "If I hold in my hand an apple and say, 'This is gold,' the proposition would be sheer nonsense; but if I say that I mean the gold coin which, unknown to any one, I have put into the core of the fruit, every one would at once feel that I was sinning against the laws of language in so expressing myself" (p. 97).

Now Dr. Smith, if he is at all acquainted with the writings of Anglican divines who acknowledge the Real Presence, knows very well that one and all of them would very energetically repudiate any such mode of illustrating our Lord's presence as that of a gold coin in the core of a fruit which a man had hidden there, and (as must unquestionably be postulated) told no one anything about it. But this illustration is not even conclusive against the sort of gross presence he would father upon us, and is capable of being effectually turned against himself. For supposing a well-to-do man had said to a poor man,

"I will give you a piece of gold, but, owing to circumstances, I cannot give it to you openly, but I must give it to you in a concealed form (in fact 'under a veil') which you must be ready to recognize or you may miss the gift." Then if the same man in due time offered his poor friend an apple, saying, with evident reference to what he had before promised, "This is gold," I think no one would say that he was sinning against the laws of language in so expressing himself: much less the poor fellow to whom the promise was made, who would immediately remember the intimation, and receive the apple not in the least degree doubting but that he would receive in it the promised gift. To make the illustration serve his purpose Franzelin has to suppose that the coin was hidden "unknown to any one": and that the words "This is gold" were said without reference to any previous promise, and solely for the purpose of asserting a secret miracle unrecognizable by the senses. But in the case of the Divine Reality, the Lord had led them to expect that He would give them His body and His blood in His discourse in Capernaum: and no one could prove this more conclusively than Dr. Smith has done in his very acute examination of the various points of our Lord's argument (pp. 69-77). If the wealthy giver had promised gold exactly equivalent in size to the whole bulk of the apple, and had only offered as much gold as could be concealed in the core, then his poor friend would have been able to accuse him of sinning, not only against the laws of language, but against the higher law of truth: but if, on the contrary, the whole matter and all its belongings are of such a character that all ideas of bulk, size, and extension are not only wholly out of place, but absolutely prejudicial and misleading; * in fact,

* This has been confessed, or rather asserted, by several leading Romish controversialists, as for instance by Bishop Gardiner.

degrading; then it is needful carefully to eschew language which, even remotely, suggests the taking into account of quantity, and extension, and even of locality; holding to this, that God who gives the highest and holiest of all conceivable substances, the body and blood of His Son, for the highest spiritual purpose—that we may dwell in Him and He in us—that God, I say, would give a thing so utterly above our thoughts in a way utterly above our thoughts, *i.e.*, in the deepest mystery. When the Romanist insists that the *whole* substance of the bread is converted into the body of Christ, he naturally invites the question, “Why the *whole* substance?” Is it a matter of quantity, of bulk, of occupying so much space, no more, and no less? “All this is,” to quote Dr. Littledale’s apt words, “to define and formulate that which, as a spiritual mystery, is incapable of such mensuration.”

The whole train of reasoning of Dr. Smith in pp. 96-99 is to me exceedingly irreverent; much more irreverent, though not more mistaken, than anything in Dr. de Pressensé or Dr. D. Brown’s essays. Dr. Brown is

“The word corporally,” he writes, “may have an ambiguity and doubleness in respect and relation: one is to the truth of the body; and so it may be said Christ is corporally present in the sacrament; (but) if the word corporally be referred to the manner of the presence, then we should say, Christ’s body were present after a corporal manner, *which we say not*, but in a spiritual manner; and therefore not locally, nor by manner of quantity, but in such manner as God only knoweth.” From Bishop Gardiner, Third Book “Of the Presence of Christ,” quoted in Cranmer’s works on the Lord’s Supper, Parker Society’s Edition, p. 89. Also in page 155 of the same: “The Catholic teaching is that the manner of Christ’s presence in the sacrament is spiritual and supernatural, not corporal, not carnal, not natural, not sensible, not perceptible, but only spiritual; the ‘how’ and manner whereof God knoweth. Taking these words as they stand, they are identical with those of our 28th Article. ‘The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.’”

utterly unconscious of anything in the way of mystery about the whole matter from beginning to end. The consecrated elements are to him mere figures suggestive of evangelical ideas.

Whereas Dr. Smith, or rather his Church, whilst acknowledging it to be the greatest thing after the Incarnation itself, defines its boundaries, fathoms its depths, scales its heights, treats it, in fact, as if he could see it through and through, within and without.

With respect to Mr. Barlow's view, or rather that of Swedenborg, it appears to me to amount to this, that Christ in the words of institution propounded an enigma, which enigma involved the true conception of *the* ordinance of His religion ; and yet His Church has had to wait for its solution till the latter part of the last century.

As far as I can gather from Mr. Barlow's paper, he affirms that "the flesh (called also body) is distinctively the embodiment of love and goodness, and the blood that of wisdom and truth, and that the Lord's Supper simply teaches us that we are to receive and appropriate the Lord's goodness and truth." But then, why should the Lord express so plain a truth in such mysterious words, which have not been apprehended till the time of Swedenborg? To "receive Christ" is the plainest thing possible to any one who has the smallest spiritual discernment. It is very plainly expressed in Scripture in such words as : "As many as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God ;" "as ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him."

The same reasoning applies to Dr. de Pressensé's very holy and spiritual paper. According to him, it is a teaching, or indeed a preaching, ordinance, telling God's people only what they must have heard and learnt before from the ordinary model evangelical sermon, that the believer has sinned ; that he is saved by the death of

Christ ; that he must consequently follow Christ ; that he must feed spiritually upon Christ ; that he must love the brethren. But, if this be what is intended by the ordinance, the words "body" and "blood" have been, till the time of Zwingli, a most serious stumbling-block. All the saints of God, from St. Paul downwards—Ignatius, Irenæus, Augustine—have learnt these evangelical truths, as they conceived, not so much from the Eucharist as from Scripture and the ordinance of preaching ; and have thought that they have received in the Lord's Supper something more than such instruction ; and this "something more" is strength from Christ's very body ; the seed of the resurrection itself ; incorporation into Christ's body, and such things.

Every sincere believer in the supernatural, as revealed in the Scriptures, must allow that there may be reasons connected with our own nature of flesh and blood, and the sin and weakness and death transmitted to us through flesh and blood, why we should receive the Lord's very body and blood. There is mystery enough about a body which the Eternal Son of God assumed ; which was conceived and born totally out of the course of nature ; which was the body of the Second Adam, the new Head of the race ; which ascended far above all heavens, and now sits at the right hand of God.—There is mystery enough, I say, about such a body to help us to take His words in humble and submissive faith. What limit can we put to its capabilities, seeing that in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily ?

If Christ be our Second Adam it seems not unlikely that we should supernaturally partake of His flesh and blood, seeing that by naturally partaking of the flesh and blood of the old Adam we receive sin and death. So that three mysteries—the profound mystery inherent in our own nature of flesh and blood, in which mind and

spirit are, as it were, incarnated, and sin in the whole—the still profounder mystery of the nature which is in store for us, the nature of the resurrection body—the profoundest mystery of all, the union of the Divine and human, the Eternal Word and the human flesh in the person of our blessed Lord,—all these things make for our taking the words of Christ in the sacramental way we have indicated.

Whilst by this way of understanding Christ's words we reject a theory of late invention which is "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture and overthroweth the nature of a sacrament," we yet hold to a more excellent way—a way even more literal, if we take full account of *all* our Redeemer's words—a more ancient way—a more reverent way—a way more consonant with that greatest of all mysteries in which two natures are united and yet each retains its integrity—a way which enables us to hold the real yet ineffable presence of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ for the highest purposes of redemption, that our "sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood;" that we may "be assured thereby of God's goodness towards us, and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of His Son which is the blessed company of all faithful people"; that we may dwell in Him and He in us here, and that He may raise us up in the likeness of His glorious body at the last day, according to His promise, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in Me and I in him," and "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

Τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων, ἀφθάρτῳ, ἀωράτῳ, μόνῳ, σοφῷ Θεῷ, τιμὴ καὶ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν.

M. F. SADLER, M.A.

Honiton.

IX.

IN this paper I shall first endeavour to expound the teaching of the New Testament about the Lord's Supper; and shall then say something about the opinions expressed in the earlier papers of this Symposium.

We must place ourselves in thought among those who heard from the lips of Christ the words in which He instituted the Supper, and try to reproduce the impression which these words would make upon them. We will then study the same words again in the light of the great fundamental truths of the gospel taught by the apostles, and especially by St. Paul. And from this study we will endeavour to learn the purpose of our Lord in instituting the Supper, and the benefits which the Church as a whole and its members as individuals may expect to receive therefrom. The results thus obtained, we will test by comparing them with St. Paul's own words about the Lord's Supper in his First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Of the four narratives of the institution of the Supper, St. Paul tells us in 1 Cor. xi. 23 expressly and emphatically that his account was derived personally from Christ. His words do not imply that it was received immediately from the lips of Christ; (for which another preposition would probably have been used, as in 1 Thess. ii. 13; iv. 1;) but that in some special manner, direct or indirect, the words of Christ were communicated to Paul.

I may perhaps reverently suggest that St. Paul's account, with which that of St. Luke is almost identical, is the more likely to be verbally exact. For the variation

This is My blood (Matt., Mark) may be accounted for by the similar words preceding, *This is My body*. Whereas the changed form *This cup is the New Covenant* (Paul and Luke) cannot be accounted for except as having come from the lips of Christ. And I think we shall find that the change guards from abuse the words *This is My body*. Therefore, among four narratives, all which have Divine authority, we may perhaps give a preference to that which St. Paul received specially from Christ.

That each account is verbally exact, is hardly possible. For it would involve a repetition unsuited to the solemnity of the occasion.

How the words of Christ were likely to be understood by those who first heard them, we will now inquire. We place ourselves among the assembled disciples. During supper the Saviour takes a loaf or cake of bread, breaks it, and gives the broken pieces to His disciples, saying, *This is My body, which is* (or *is being broken* or *given*) *on your behalf*. They could not possibly conceive Him to mean that the bread was actually His own body. Else He would have two bodies visible together in the same room, each being given for His disciples. And the body crucified the next day was then living and uninjured: whereas the bread was already broken. They could only understand His words to mean that the bread was symbolical, and the breaking and distribution of it prophetic, signifying and announcing that the body now living before their eyes was to die, for their spiritual nourishment. Comp. Isa. xx. 2 ff.; Hosea i. 4. Just as we point to a picture and say, without fear of being misunderstood, *This is my father, or my house*, so the disciples would naturally understand our Lord's words. And their interpretation would be confirmed by the words following. For the cup was not even practically identical with the Covenant. A cup given and received signified that the

covenant was ratified and was already in force: whereas the New Covenant was not ratified till the actual blood of Christ was shed. But the poured-out wine was a prophetic symbol of the blood soon to be shed. And, therefore, the cup given and received was a silent announcement of the Covenant of which that blood was the pledge. This interpretation, which would naturally suggest itself at once, would be confirmed by the repeated words *For a remembrance of Me*. For the symbols of the broken body and of the Covenant ratified in blood would recall forcibly, to those who in after years broke the bread and drank the wine, the memory of Him who died that they might live.

This exposition does not assume that the disciples as they gathered on that night round the Saviour understood the full import of His words and actions. How these were understood by St. Paul, we must gather from his own exposition of his own narrative, and from 1 Cor. x. 16-21, etc. And upon the meaning intended by Christ, light is cast by His own words in John vi. 48-58. These will enable us to test, and will supplement, the exposition just given of Christ's words when instituting the Supper.

The words of Christ in John vi. 48-58 and at the last Supper, and the references to the Supper by St. Paul, will be to us an enigma incapable of solution unless we read them in the light of the abundant and clear teaching of St. Paul and the other sacred writers, and of our Lord Himself, about the connection between His death and our salvation. This teaching we will therefore now consider.

St. Paul asserts again and again, with perfect confidence but without proof, as needing no proof, that our salvation comes through Christ's death: comp. Rom. iii. 24-26; v. 6-10; xiv. 9, 15; 2 Cor. v. 15, 21; Gal. iii. 13; Eph. i. 7; ii. 13, 16; Col. i. 20, etc. We have the same teach-

ing in Heb. ix. 12; x. 19; 1 Peter i. 19; ii. 24; iii. 18; Rev. i. 5; v. 6-9; vii. 14. And it is expressly attributed to Christ in Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; John x. 11; xii. 24.

We are also taught that our spiritual and eternal life comes to us by spiritual contact with Christ, an inward and all-pervading contact of Spirit with spirit, such that Christ lives in us, imparting to us thus His own immortal life. So Gal. ii. 20, *Christ liveth in me*; Rom. viii. 10, *If Christ be in you; . . . the spirit is life*; 1 Cor. vi. 17, *He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit*; John xv. 5, *He that abideth in Me and I in him, this man beareth much fruit*; and many other passages. This great doctrine is asserted expressly by Christ in John vi. 56, at the close of the passage under discussion.

Of this inward and all-pervading contact with Christ, the Holy Spirit, sent down by the crucified and risen and enthroned Son of God, is the Divine Agent. Where the Spirit is, there and there only Christ is. So Rom. viii. 9, 10; 1 Cor. xii. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 17, etc.

The foregoing doctrines are, in my view, a complete explanation and justification, and the only conceivable explanation, of John vi. 51-58. For these verses reveal a mysterious analogy between our relation to Christ and the relation of our bodily life to food, especially to animal food. The maintenance of bodily life involves the destruction of that which once had vegetable or animal life. The meat set before us to eat has been purchased by shedding of blood and destruction of innocent life. And food nourishes us only so far as it enters into our bodily nature and becomes part of ourselves. Now we have just seen that the New Testament teaches again and again that our life involves the shedding of Christ's blood and the slaughter of His body, and a reception of His nature into our nature. These great truths fully justify, and find their most conspicuous

embodiment in, the astounding words of Christ recorded in John vi.

That these words stand in an important relation to the Lord's Supper, I cannot doubt. Surely they would at once rise to the minds of those who heard Him say of the broken bread, *This is My body*. And this could not be without Christ's design. But I prefer to say that Christ's words on both occasions refer to the same great mystery rather than that either discourse refers to the other.

We come now, prepared by our study of Christ's words in John vi. 33-58 and of the teaching of St. Paul, to listen again to Christ's words as recorded in 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. In ver. 26 Paul tells us that (just as the gospel is a verbal announcement that through the shedding of the blood of Christ God covenants to pardon sin and give eternal life to all who believe, so) the Lord's Supper is an announcement of the same by visible emblematic action. And this is given as an explanation of the words of Christ. We infer then that the *memorial of Me* is chiefly a memorial that our nourishment comes through Christ's death; and we infer that Christ ordained the Supper to keep this great truth before the mind and in the heart of His people.

Again, the proclamation of this truth is the Divinely chosen means of conveying, to those who believe it, the life which flows from Christ's death. And, to those within sound of the gospel, the Truth is the only channel through which this life flows. Now the preached word gives life only through the presence and agency of the Spirit of Christ, who makes the words of mortal men to be the channel through which the Spirit of Life enters into, and gives life to, those who believe. The universality of this principle compels us to apply it also to the Truth as set forth visibly in the sacred emblems. Therefore, just as in the preached word there is, in some sense

to all who hear it and in the fullest sense to those who receive it by faith, the real, living, active, objective presence of the crucified and living Saviour, so we need not hesitate to say that in the same sense, but in a more conspicuous because unexpected manner, He is present in the sacramental feast.

Again, Christ has bidden us expressly, at the most solemn period of His life and in the most solemn manner possible, to eat the bread and drink the wine; and St. Paul's exposition in ver. 26 makes this command binding to the end of time. This command of Christ makes material eating and drinking an essential condition of salvation. For, not to eat and drink would be direct disobedience to Christ, and therefore a renunciation of the covenant of which the cup is an emblem. Consequently, with exceptions noted below, unless we eat and drink the bread and wine we cannot share the results of Christ's broken body and shed blood. In other words, to refuse the bread and the wine, is, in ordinary cases, to refuse to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ.

Now, practically, in our thought we cannot distinguish between a condition performed in order to obtain that which depends upon it, and an instrument with which we lay hold of something we desire. Consequently, we cannot but look upon both faith and the Lord's Supper (both being simple conditions of salvation) as instruments by which we lay hold of Christ. We may therefore say correctly, as in x. 16, that by receiving the material elements we become sharers of the body and blood of Christ; and that our entire spiritual life (comp. x. 17a), each moment received from Christ, is a result of our reception at intervals of the bread and wine.

We need not, however, suppose that participation in the Lord's Supper is another condition of salvation besides faith. Rather, Christ's command has made

any meaning to Matt. xxvi. 28: *This is My blood of the covenant, which is being poured out for many for forgiveness of sins.* We therefore cannot doubt that one of the many purposes Christ had in view in ordaining the Supper was that it might be an abiding monument in His Church to the truth and importance of this doctrine.

We shall now understand all that the New Testament says about the Lord's Supper. Well might Christ say, *This is My body.* For, had not Christ been on the way to die that His followers might live, there had been no bread in His hands for distribution to them. And, had there not been a new covenant between God and us (virtual then, ratified now), there had been no poured-out wine. Therefore, as setting forth, and implying, a solemn reality, and as an essential condition of sharing its benefits, the cup is both the blood of Christ and the New Covenant. And, as setting forth and implying and bringing about (as an essential condition, and therefore as in some sense an instrument) a participation in the results of the death of Christ, the bread and the cup are (1 Cor. x. 16) *a fellowship of the body and blood of Christ.* In the same way all manifestations of the Christian life are a result of the sacred feast. Therefore, the outward and visible unity of believers is a result (1 Cor. x. 17) of their joint reception of the same sacred food. Since the Supper was ordained by Christ, it is, with all its consequent blessings (1 Cor. x. 21), *a table of the Lord.* Since it is a visible symbol of Christ crucified and a solemnly ordained means of consolidating and extending His kingdom, any indignity done to the feast is done to Christ, and specially to the body and blood bruised and shed for us. Such indignity betrays an oversight of the dread reality, even *the crucified body*, which the symbols set forth. Upon such indignity Christ at once pronounces, and at Corinth (1 Cor. xi. 30) at once inflicted, punish-

face of the hostile and powerful influences which beset its early course, and for its spread over the world. And we cannot conceive any means so likely to secure this visible unity as this simple rite. To perpetuate the rite and thus to give corporate form to His followers, Christ instituted it at the most solemn period of His life, and, by commanding them to observe it in remembrance of Himself, made it practically a condition of salvation.

Again, that Christ commands, as a condition of salvation, a bodily reception of material bread and wine, gives to these elements a mysterious and unique dignity. (Similarly, God's choice of a spoken word as the channel of salvation gives to the human voice an inconceivable dignity.) Since the eating and drinking which Christ requires is real, we may say that His command makes our reception of the spiritual, and ultimately material, benefits purchased by the death of His body and the shedding of His blood conditional, with the exceptions marked below, on our reception into our own bodies of the material bread and wine. Christ has thus placed these elements of food in a unique relation to Himself. Remembering this, as we look at them we may almost forget the material food produced by nature and by human manipulation, and think only of the pierced body and shed blood, without which there had been no bread and wine on the sacramental table, and of the spiritual nourishment we derive therefrom. To the eye of faith the symbols disappear, and the infinite and amazing reality alone remains.

Once more. The Lord's Supper is a wonderful testimony to the great doctrine that our salvation comes through His death. For this doctrine is the only conceivable explanation of the prominence given to Christ's death both by the institution of the Supper and by the words of the institution. Not otherwise can we give

any meaning to Matt. xxvi. 28: *This is My blood of the covenant, which is being poured out for many for forgiveness of sins.* We therefore cannot doubt that one of the many purposes Christ had in view in ordaining the Supper was that it might be an abiding monument in His Church to the truth and importance of this doctrine.

We shall now understand all that the New Testament says about the Lord's Supper. Well might Christ say, *This is My body.* For, had not Christ been on the way to die that His followers might live, there had been no bread in His hands for distribution to them. And, had there not been a new covenant between God and us (virtual then, ratified now), there had been no poured-out wine. Therefore, as setting forth, and implying, a solemn reality, and as an essential condition of sharing its benefits, the cup is both the blood of Christ and the New Covenant. And, as setting forth and implying and bringing about (as an essential condition, and therefore as in some sense an instrument) a participation in the results of the death of Christ, the bread and the cup are (1 Cor. x. 16) *a fellowship of the body and blood of Christ.* In the same way all manifestations of the Christian life are a result of the sacred feast. Therefore, the outward and visible unity of believers is a result (1 Cor. x. 17) of their joint reception of the same sacred food. Since the Supper was ordained by Christ, it is, with all its consequent blessings (1 Cor. x. 21), *a table of the Lord.* Since it is a visible symbol of Christ crucified and a solemnly ordained means of consolidating and extending His kingdom, any indignity done to the feast is done to Christ, and specially to the body and blood bruised and shed for us. Such indignity betrays an oversight of the dread reality, even *the crucified body*, which the symbols set forth. Upon such indignity Christ at once pronounces, and at Corinth (1 Cor. xi. 30) at once inflicted, punish-

ment. Therefore, by eating and drinking without an apprehension of the reality set forth by the bread and wine, the guilty ones were *eating and drinking*, not, as they thought, mere bread and wine, but (1 Cor. xi. 29) God's *judgment* upon themselves. For, by eating and drinking they brought upon themselves condemnation and punishment.

To the teaching just expounded, I do not know that the New Testament makes any material addition. And the whole of it is but a development of Christ's words at the institution of the Supper, in the light of great doctrines taught throughout the New Testament.

I cannot pass over the fact that some very godly men—I refer chiefly to the Society of Friends—set aside altogether the outward and visible celebration of the Lord's Supper. How they reconcile this with Christ's words, *Do this*, and with St. Paul's explanation of them in 1 Cor. xi. 26, I do not know. That they lose much by refusing, even in ignorance, to obey the express and solemn command of Christ, I cannot doubt. But if their refusal arises from sincere, even though mistaken, loyalty to Christ, God will not refuse them a part in that New Covenant of which they refuse the visible pledge and condition. And for the loss they sustain by absence from the Lord's table, no small part of the blame rests upon those who by their misrepresentation and misuse have brought it into contempt. But were I to absent myself as they do, I should thereby exclude myself from the Covenant. For I should refuse to do that which I believe Christ has expressly and solemnly bidden. It is worthy of notice, in view of 1 Cor. x. 17, that the united influence upon the world of the Society of Friends bears no proportion to the personal excellence of its members.

In the New Testament the Lord's Supper is never said to be a sacrifice. But its connection with the Jewish

Passover reminds us that it is in some sense a sacrificial act. The many Mosaic rites are analogous to, though infinitely surpassed by, the one Christian rite. The old sacrifices set forth in symbol the truth that man's salvation comes through the death of the innocent ; and, as solemnly ordained by God (Exod. xxiv. 8) at the ratification of the Old Covenant, they were a condition on which its benefits were obtained. Consequently, after disuse in times of spiritual declension, the sacrifices were restored (2 Chron. xxix. 7ff, 20ff) in times of spiritual revival. Now the Lord's Supper is the one recurrent rite of the New Covenant. Of this Covenant, the most conspicuous feature is the forgiveness of sins : comp. Matt. xxvi. 28 ; Heb. viii. 12. Therefore, while receiving the Supper in faith, we claim from God the benefits of the Covenant, and especially the forgiveness of our sins. (For the symbols of His death proclaim the guilt of us for whose sins He died.) We thus present to God, for our own sins, in our hearts and by faith, the pierced body and shed blood of Christ : for we hide us beneath His cross from the penalty of our sins. And, while we do so, the blood of Christ saves us from the anger of God : for (Rom. iii. 25) *in His blood* Christ becomes to each man *through faith* an actual *propitiation* for his own sins. Thus, in the Lord's Supper we do a spiritual act analogous to the sprinkling of the blood by the High Priest once a year in the Most Holy Place. For, they *that believe* (1 Peter ii. 5, 7) are a *holy priesthood*. But, since we do but present to God personally as a propitiation for our own sins the blood already shed once for all on Calvary as (1 John ii. 2) a *propitiation for the sins of the whole world*, it is better to speak of the Sacrament as a sacrificial act rather than as a sacrifice.

We conclude then that Christ ordained the Supper in order to give great prominence, in the eyes of even the

humblest believer, to the all-important truth that our eternal life comes through His death ; also as a means of testing, developing, and confessing to the world, our belief that salvation is an outworking of a power which cannot be explained by, and is altogether above, the laws of mind and morals ; and as a means of giving to His people corporate and visible unity in face of the world. In order to secure, to the end of time, the perpetuity of the rite, and thus to secure the aims just mentioned, Christ made the rite, by solemnly enjoining its observance, an indispensable condition of salvation. And, since in the kingdom of God there are no useless conditions, He determined to make it a channel through which, by His own active presence, He would pour the spiritual benefits therein set forth. We infer that, as in the preached so in the symbolic word, the designed benefits are received only by those who believe. And, since unbelief in those who partake the Supper implies resistance to the truths therein conspicuously and forcefully portrayed, and great dishonour to Him who died even for those who reject Him, we infer that in a very terrible sense the sacred rite is, to those who misuse it for their own base ends, and thus betray their ignorance of its true significance, *an odour* (2 Cor. ii. 16) *from death tending to death*.

We must now say a few words about the primitive mode of holding the Supper.

It is quite certain that the excesses corrected in 1 Cor. xi. 18-34 occurred at the sacramental Supper. For the *Lord's Supper* in ver. 20 can be no other than *the bread* and *the cup of the Lord* in ver. 27. And St. Paul's argument in ver. 21, namely, that to take beforehand each his own supper made it impossible for the meal to be the Lord's Supper, implies that the food thus taken was not merely eaten in connection with the sacred symbols, but

was actually that very food and drink which ought to be received by all together as a supper provided by Christ ; otherwise the Corinthians would be able to reply that they did not profess that the food taken beforehand was a supper provided specially by Christ, and that the difference in their modes of receiving the Lord's Supper, namely, from the hands of the Church officers, and of keeping the collateral feast, testified the unique importance they attached to the former. This proof is confirmed by the solemn warning in ver. 27, in support of the reproof in ver. 22, that they who *eat or drink unworthily will be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord*. This warning Paul applies expressly in ver. 33 to the abuses at Corinth. We therefore cannot accept the opinion of Chrysostom, Estius, and others, that these abuses occurred at a semi-spiritual repast partaken in connection with the Lord's Supper.

If these abuses occurred at the Lord's Supper, St. Paul's reference to them becomes our earliest and most valuable source of information about the primitive mode of its celebration. That private members were able to appropriate beforehand the food designed for the communion, implies that they were not in the habit of receiving the bread and wine from the officers of the Church. That Paul did not reprove them for not receiving it thus, and did not even recommend it, although it would have effectually prevented the abuses in question, shows clearly that he did not look upon the reception of the elements from the hands of the Church officers as essential to the validity of the sacrament. And the same is confirmed by the absence of any censure on the officers of the Church, who, if the distribution of the sacred symbols had been committed to them only, would have been chiefly to blame. From this we infer with certainty that when Christ instituted the Supper He did not direct that it

should be administered only by the officers of the Church ; and that at the time when the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written no such direction had been given by the apostles. Nor have we in the New Testament any hint that such direction was afterwards given.

That the sacred feast was looked upon as a means of satisfying hunger, and that drinking to excess was possible, is further proof how widely different was the mode of its celebration from that which prevailed soon afterwards.

In contrast to the foregoing inferences from an Epistle of St. Paul, I may quote Justin (A.D. 103-165, about), who in his "Apology" (i. 85) says : "After the prayer we greet one another with a kiss. Then bread and a pitcher with water and mixed wine are brought to the leader of the assembly. The leader takes this, blesses and praises the Father of the universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and thanks Him specifically that He has thought us worthy of these gifts. The whole assembly concludes this prayer with an Amen. The deacons, as we call them, then present to each of the assembled ones bread, wine, and water, over which prayer has been pronounced ; and for the absent ones we take them to their houses." Also Tertullian, in ch. iii. of his treatise "On the Soldier's Crown," says : "The sacrament of the Eucharist, we receive from the hands of none but of those who preside."

The force of the above argument from 1 Cor. xi. 20-33 is felt, and put very clearly, by the able and candid Roman Catholic commentator, Estius. To evade it, he is compelled to suppose that the abuses in question occurred, not at the Lord's Supper, but at a repast partaken in connection with it. This opinion I have already attempted to disprove.

The mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper during the latter part of the apostolic age we have no means of tracing. Consequently, the limitation of its administration to the officers of the Church cannot claim undoubted apostolic authority. But it has been, as a matter of Church order, the universal, or nearly universal, practice of the entire Church of Christ, in all its sections and in all countries, from the second century to the present day. From so general a practice, as matter of Church order, few will have, without very special reasons, the hardihood to dissent.

I must now refer to the earlier papers of this Symposium.

The paper which seems to me to fall furthest below the true significance of the Lord's Supper is that of Mr. J. P. Hopps. To my astonishment he says on page 28: "As a rule, too, it is too much connected with the sacrifice or death of Christ on Calvary, and with some theory of the way of salvation through His atoning blood; and yet, singularly enough, the Master Himself appeared to have nothing in His mind (!!) but a loving brother's desire to leave behind Him some pathetic memorial of a communion that was passing away, but only to receive the consecration of the heavenly world." If Christ had nothing but this in His mind, how came it that in each report of His words of institution He is represented as calling special attention to His *blood*, as being (Matt. and Mark) *poured out on behalf of many*, or (Luke) *on behalf of you, for the forgiveness of sins* (Matt., Mark), and in connection (Luke and Paul) with *the New Covenant*. And how came it that Paul explains in 1 Cor. xi. 26 the meaning of the words of institution by saying that *how often soever ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye announce the death of the Lord*; and that he speaks of the unworthy recipient of the bread and wine as guilty of sin against the body and blood of Christ? How, after

reading these words, any one can think it possible to "connect" the Lord's Supper "too much with the sacrifice and death of Christ on Calvary," passes my comprehension. Singularly enough, of the above-quoted definite and startling words of Christ and of Paul, Mr. Hopps does not attempt any explanation whatever. With a writer who thus ignores the most conspicuous facts of the case, further argument is needless.

I cannot conceal my regret that the "Declaration of the Faith, etc., of the Congregational or Independent Dissenters," printed in the "Congregational Year Book," gives only, in reference to the Lord's Supper, a doctrine practically identical with that of Mr. Hopps. By no means do I infer that this document tells all that our Congregational brethren believe. But it is unfortunate that they do not feel it absolutely necessary to assert, in a public "Declaration of Faith," much more than they have done. It is as important to protest against the materialism which denies the supernatural power of Christianity as against the sacerdotalism which seeks to monopolise it.

With pleasure I notice that the "Declaration" is condemned by an eminent Congregational minister, the Rev. R. W. Dale, in a most able essay on "The Doctrine of the Real Presence and of the Lord's Supper" in a volume entitled "Ecclesia," published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. He admits, on page 371, that "there can be little doubt that modern Congregationalists, in their extreme dread of high sacramental doctrines, have drifted into pure Zwinglianism ; it is possible that some of them have drifted further still."

Between the teaching of Luther and the Lutheran Church and that of Calvin and the Churches which in this matter follow him, the chief differences, as I understand them, are that Luther taught the local presence of

Christ in the bread and wine, whereas Calvin taught only that Christ is spiritually though really and actually present in the hearts of those who in faith receive the bread and wine ; and that Lutherans hold that all who receive the elements thereby and therein receive Christ, either to bless or to condemn, whereas Calvin made the reception of Christ in the Supper conditional on the participant's faith. In these points Luther falls short of the Roman doctrine only in asserting that the elements, while containing the body and blood of Christ, are still real bread and wine.

I venture to believe that these differences are practically not so great as they appear ; that they are rather verbal than real. Each doctrine contains important elements of truth. Many godly Roman Catholics cling to transubstantiation as being the strongest protest they can make against prevalent materialism. And even Zwingli, in his strong rebound from papal assumptions, still asserted the Divine institution and perpetual obligation of the material, though sacred, feast. We have seen what this obligation involves. Luther and the Roman Church assert that, though all who receive the Supper therein receive Christ, nevertheless upon themselves it depends whether Christ comes into them to save or to condemn. And Calvin taught that, even to those who receive it unworthily, the Lord's Supper has terrible reality, a reality of condemnation. So far then the differences are not serious.

At the same time, in reference to the second difference mentioned above, I notice that in the New Testament Christ is never said to be inwardly present except to bless. And, that Christ is received in the Supper even by unbelieving recipients, is not implied in, but is rather contradicted by, 1 Cor. x. 21, which sums up an argument (1 Cor. x. 16-21) to which Lutherans frequently appeal.

For the argument requires that all who sit down at an idol feast thereby become, even without designing or knowing it, supporters of idolatry, and thus allies of those evil spirits who by means of idolatry enslave mankind. Now it was quite possible for a man to take part on the same day both in an idol feast and the Lord's Supper. But St. Paul declares that to partake in the former made it impossible to *partake the Lord's table*. This impossibility shows that he refers to a participation which was conditional on faith. This argument may seem to rest on a narrow basis. But it is sufficient to rebut the argument which Lutherans build on the passage in question.

Touching the first difference mentioned above, my exposition at the beginning of this paper proves, I venture to think, that a full belief in the real and life-giving presence of Christ in the Supper does not involve a belief that He is locally and peculiarly present within the material and visible limits of the bread and wine.

Calvin and many Anglican writers cling to the expression that in some sense believers actually though spiritually receive in the Supper the body and blood of Christ. But to these words I can give no meaning except that believers receive, by the entrance of the Spirit of Christ into their hearts, the spiritual, and will receive the bodily, benefits which result from His crucifixion: and, to express this by the words "receive the body of Christ," seems to me inappropriate.

Having mentioned matters of secondary importance, I am now compelled to point out what seems to me to be a most serious error in the teaching both of the Roman Church and of a considerable section of the Anglican Church, an error from which, I believe, the teaching of Luther and that of Calvin are free.

With not a little that Dr. Smith says I agree. His

reply to Dr. Brown's argument about the words *remembrance of Me* seems to me unanswerable. And I readily acknowledge that the exposition "This represents My body," and the comparison of a portrait, though forming a suitable starting-point for investigation, fall far short of our Saviour's full meaning. The relation between the sacred elements and the crucified body and shed blood of Christ is, as we have seen, far closer than mere representation.

But Dr. Smith has passed in total silence over the fundamental difference between Protestants and the Roman Church, namely, the Roman claim to a practical monopoly of the benefits conveyed by the Supper. With him I joyfully believe that in the Supper we have, not merely a memorial of the historic past, but the real and supernatural and active presence and power of Christ, that His presence raises the sacred feast infinitely above the rites of the Old Testament, gives to the bread and wine a unique and mysterious dignity, and makes the feast a channel of the life-giving grace which flows through the cross of Christ. But the Roman Church claims that its priesthood is the only channel through which we have a right to expect the spiritual blessings signified and conveyed by the Supper. This claim is the greatest which a Church can possibly make. For, if conceded, the express and solemn command of Christ to keep the Supper is virtually a command to submit to the spiritual rule of the Roman Hierarchy. Against this claim I am compelled to protest. And in spite of my love for our brethren of the Roman Church and my great admiration of many men who in the various ages of the Church have asserted and boldly fought for the claim against which I protest, I am compelled to believe that to the continued protests which since the days of Luther have been made against this claim is due no small part

of the spiritual life enjoyed now not only by Protestants but even by Roman Catholics.

To discuss this claim within the limits of this paper is impossible. For the grounds on which it rests are, I must admit, neither absurd nor insignificant. I venture however to state two arguments which will occupy only a few words, and of which the force is, I think, at once apparent.

Put into another form, the question before us is, Are there any circumstances which justify a body of men, whether or not previously organized as an integral part of the universal Church, in separating from the historic Church and setting up in place of it a separate worship of their own? This question the Roman Church answers in the negative. And, had a similar question been asked touching the temple worship of the Old Covenant, it would have been rightly answered in the negative. Those who hold what may be called Anglican views believe that circumstances did justify in their case a regularly constituted Church in breaking away (at the bidding of a bad layman with bad motives) from the mother of the Western Churches. And the early Protestants of Germany and the English Nonconformists believed, and their descendants now believe, that their circumstances justified and justify them, though not then forming a regularly-organized Church, in separating and remaining separate from the Church of their fathers.

It is right to say that the different answers given to the above question put an infinite and practical difference between the teaching both of Luther and Calvin and that of the Roman Church; and that, by claiming a monopoly of the administration of the Lord's Supper in this country, many members of the Anglican Church place themselves practically beside the Roman Church and at an infinite distance from all the Protestant Churches of the continent.

The Anglican reply to the above question seems to me altogether unsatisfactory. A Church which received through the Bishop of Rome the orders on which rest its claims to ecclesiastical prerogative, is in abiding revolt against the authority of the Bishop of Rome ; and yet claims, in the person of many of its ministers, a spiritual authority akin to that claimed by the Roman Church.

One question only I ask of my brethren of the Anglican school, many of whom I greatly respect as able and successful toilers for Jesus : What would you do if you were Germans in Germany ? Certainly the German Protestants cannot and do not claim for their churches what you claim for yours. And what you claim from English Nonconformists, the Roman Catholic Church in Germany claims with equal right, or absence of right, from German Protestants. Do you then say that the German Protestants are bound to join the Church of Rome ? Yet, if it be right for them to continue in separation from the Church of their forefathers, surely we cannot be bound to submit to the authority of the Church which at the bidding of Henry VIII. seceded from Rome.

A few words now in reference both to the Roman and Anglican claims. If these claims are just, Protestantism in all its forms, and especially English Nonconformity, is a revolt against an authority ordained by Christ to administer the salvation bought for men with His own blood. Now can any one conceive that a king would confer on men in high-handed rebellion the favour which God has indisputably poured for centuries on Protestant and Nonconformist communities. If these spiritual blessings were occasional and transient and to few men, they might be looked upon as exceptional. But a comparison of the Protestant and Roman Catholic countries of the world, and of the Nonconformist and

Anglican Churches of this country, forbids the suggestion. May we not use to our Catholic brethren the argument used by St. Peter with admitted force to the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, and ask that those who have evidently received *the equal gift* (Acts xi. 17) be acknowledged as having equal rights as members of the Church of Christ?

One more appeal. In beautiful language Dr. Smith reminds us that by actual experience he and his Catholic brethren know that Christ is really and gloriously present in the Supper and in His Church. A similar experience banishes from the mind of thousands of Protestants all doubts about the safety of their ecclesiastical position. Christ is with them. His smile is their sunshine in the midst of storm and darkness. His presence is their guide and strength amid the perplexities and weariness of life. And many who once received with them the symbols of the dead yet living and present Saviour have found that in the hour of death the presence of Jesus was their life. To say to such men that the living presence of Christ depends upon communion with the Church of Rome, is to ask them to contradict an experience which has permeated and ennobled their entire life. These cases are so many that they cannot be looked upon as exceptions to the ordinary administration of Christ in His Church. They are therefore, I venture to believe, a standing disproof of the claims of the Roman Church. Unfortunately, this kind of proof comes only in small part within the observation of those who assert the Roman claims. But many arguments which give full and intelligent conviction to our own minds cannot be reproduced to others in practical force, because the facts on which they rest are known only to ourselves. I have stated this personal and private argument, not to convince Dr. Smith, but to explain the reasons which justify to

Protestants their continued separation from the Church of Rome.

Dr. Smith speaks of the Catholic temple in which Catholics offer a worship universal in space and ceaseless in time. May I be allowed to say to him that, although for reasons to us all-important and imperative we are unable to join them in outward communion now, we nevertheless in spirit already join in their worship and bow with them in the real objective presence of Christ, eagerly waiting for that day when they and we and the whole family of God shall together bow before His throne and join in one grand harmony of praise to Him who has bought us with His blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation, and has made us a kingdom and priests to our God.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

X.

IT is admitted by all Christians that the Holy Communion is one of the few religious functions for which we have the direct sanction of Christ Himself; and it is therefore all the more surprising that it is the one function which a large majority of professing Christians would seem most resolutely to avoid.

Is it possible that this practical neglect of the sacred ordinance may be, to some extent, the natural result of the methods by which Christian teachers have sought to enforce its importance?

Intelligent laymen can hardly avoid a feeling of suspicion when they hear the most sacred of Christian ordinances pressed upon their attention with an amount of shallow, unscientific, and second-hand dogmatism, which would discredit, once and for all, the teaching of any instructor upon secular matters.

For instance, what can be thought of the logical acumen of a young preacher, who, on the tacit *assumption* that our Lord's teaching in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel was intended for an explanation of the sacrament, proceeds to explain to his hearers that, unless they come regularly to the Holy Communion, they can have no part in the resurrection of the just? And how can any man attempt to dogmatize as to the number of times a year that a Christian ought to partake of the sacred feast, when the Great Master thought fit to leave it an entirely open question.

That is, as far as the Gospel account is concerned, for

of course we shall be told that Christ did leave instructions about the matter with the apostles, and that they carried them into effect by celebrating the Holy Communion every Lord's Day in the Primitive Church. Very likely He did; but we simply wish to observe that an argument of this kind carries little practical conviction to the average lay mind, which does not see, and does not wish to see, any very close resemblance between the Church of the first century and that of the nineteenth.

The experience of the present carries much more weight than that of the long-buried past.

It has often occurred to us whether any man, with a good biographical library at his command, would ever gird himself to compile, in the form of a tract suitable for distribution, the recorded experiences of eminent saints, of all modern churches and schools of thought, as to the actual personal spiritual benefits which they feel themselves to have received from the sacrament.

A record of such experiences, in a handy form, would, we believe, have more efficacy than any amount of theory, either true or false, about the practice of the early Church.

It is also useful for a pastor to be able to say, "John Smith, who, as you all know, never turned his back on the Lord's Table in this house of prayer, was at last kept at home by lingering illness; he told me that he *felt* the loss of the sacrament so much, that he would be much obliged if I would take it to him in private as often as he had been accustomed to receive it in public."

Again, supposing that a Catholic or High Anglican wishes to show that the Sacrament has a sacrificial aspect, and he has to meet objections based on the words "it is finished," or "once offered," he may attempt to do so by some elaborate argument, involving an intimate acquaintance with the Book of Leviticus, both in the Hebrew and in the Septuagint Version. Such an argument, however,

is unintelligible to nine-tenths or more of the general Christian public.

It will be best for him to meet the words "it is finished" boldly, and to say that Christ only alluded to the completion of His work on the theatre of this visible world ; that the next act of the tragedy was played in Hades, where another citadel of Satan's was stormed ; and that the great Paschal Lamb was there roasted with fire, after having been slain on Calvary.

He had better grapple in the same way with the words "once offered," and lay down the broad principle, which any layman can understand, that the whole of Christ's work on earth is a shadow of His *eternal* work within the veil ; and that if it is allowable to regard His miracles of healing the body once as types of His spiritual healing of the soul now, it is equally fair to regard His work on Calvary as an emblem of something which is taking place now.

And, to speak generally, may we not regard every event in time, so far as it is not futile or sinful (for is not sin *essentially* futility?), as the shadow of some eternal reality at present unintelligible to our capacities ?

Again, how should teachers approach the subject of the connection between God's presence and the visible elements of bread and wine ?

As to transubstantiation we will say nought, save that to teach it appears to us, to use the well-known argument, much the same thing as to strike at the root of Christianity itself ; for the central historical fact of the resurrection rests upon the evidence of the natural senses of a handful of unimaginative working people ; and if our natural senses are deceived as to the nature of the elements of bread and wine after the words of consecration, may not the natural senses of the disciples have been deceived too ?

of course
tions also
carried th
nion ever
likely II
argument
to the av
not wish
Church of

The ex
than that

It has
good biog
gird himse
for distri
saints, of
to the actu
themselves

A record
we believe, i
either true or

It is also
Smith, who
the Lord's Tai
at home by lin
loss of the sac

obliged if I would
he had been accus

Again, suppose
wishes to show th
and the fact that the
fact that the fact
fact that the fact
fact that the fact
fact that the fact

ordinary prayer they seek for God's manifold gifts of grace as they see their need for any in particular ; but that in the Sacrament they should look to receive grace, not indeed indefectible, but whole and entire as far as it goes.

THOMAS LEACH.

Burton-in-Lonsdale.

XI.

WE have read with much interest the papers contained in the Symposium on the Lord's Supper.* They are all of a high order, and are able defences and statements more or less distinct of the views entertained by the different sections in the Christian Church. It is very little that we can add by way of supplement, as the subject appears to be well-nigh exhausted.

The Lord's Supper was evidently designed by our Lord to promote unity and brotherly love among those who profess to be His disciples. It is one of the outward badges of His Church, by which it is to be distinguished from the world, and by which its members are to know each other and to hold fellowship together. It is denominated by all parties the *communion*. It must then strike every Christian as extraordinary that that very ordinance which of all others was designed for union should have been so perverted or misunderstood as of all other rites of our religion to be the great cause and occasion of disunion and bitter animosities among the disciples of Christ. Different interpretations of its nature have created an unsurmountable barrier of separation between different branches of the Christian Church; and what is still more strange, even those who hold similar views of this ordinance, but differ on other points, denote their disunion by saying that they belong to different communions, and

* This paper was written before having read the articles in the Symposium contained in the July number, which articles are referred to in the notes.

rarely partake together of the Sacrament of the Supper ; and thus the Lord's Supper is changed from being the badge of union of the whole Christian Church, to be the badge of union of the members of a particular sect. The body of Christ has thus been broken in a very different sense from what He intended when He said, " This is My body broken for you."

And yet when we read the account of the institution as contained in the synoptical Gospels and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, there is a beautiful simplicity about the ordinance. We do not think that a Christian, freed from all preconceived notions, and who had never heard of the controversies in the Church about this ordinance, would have much difficulty in understanding its import and design. Our Lord was about to leave this world, He was about to consummate His mission into it by the crowning sacrifice of Himself ; and in His farewell interview with His disciples, He instituted this ordinance to be a perpetual memorial of His death. He was partaking with His disciples of the Paschal Supper ; and He set apart the bread and the wine then lying on the table before Him to be the materials employed in the ordinance of the Supper. He took the bread and gave it to His disciples, and said, " Take, eat, this is My body broken for you." And He took the cup, saying, " This cup is the new covenant in My blood, shed for many for the remission of sins : drink ye all of it." And then He comforts them amid their sorrow at His departure by referring them to His second coming and to their participation with Him of the new wine in the kingdom of God.

Nevertheless this apparently simple ordinance has been converted by the Romanists into a pompous ceremony ; the communion table has been changed into an altar, and the bread and the wine regarded as a sacrifice. They have invested the Lord's Supper with an awful mysterious-

ness. They suppose that by the very words of consecration—"This is My body"—the bread is actually converted into the veritable body of Christ, and the wine into His blood; that the whole Christ, both in His divinity and in His humanity, is contained in each of the elements, and is the object of adoration to the spectators. And they think that Christ's body is thus offered up as a sacrifice to God both for the living and the dead. This, they assert, is the plain and literal meaning of the ordinance. "The words, 'This is My body, this is my blood,'" observes Dr. Smith, "are so simple in themselves, and the assertion so unqualified, that without an accumulation of terms it is impossible to express more clearly the fact of the Real Presence under the Sacramental species." But it is evident that the words, "This bread is converted into My body, this wine is converted into My blood," would express the fact of the Real Presence more clearly and more unmistakably. Besides, the whole words of the institution are not taken literally; for Jesus does not say of the wine, "This is my blood," but "This cup is the new covenant in my blood."* And further, according to the literal acceptation, the body and the blood of Christ must be separated; for the bread is converted into the body alone, and the wine into the blood alone. "As the bread," observes Calvin, "is given separately from the cup, so the body united to the bread must be separate from the blood included in the cup." But this literal rendering of the words is not in accordance with the views of the Romanists. "There is," observes Dr. Smith, "no real separation between the body and the blood in the Eucharist." But *there must be a real separation*, if the words are to be taken literally. But the great objection to this doctrine of transubstantiation is not that it is

* So it is given in Luke xxii. 20, and 1 Cor. xi. 25.

above, but that it is *contrary to*, reason. It asserts that a material body can be in a thousand different places at one and the same time, a statement which no authority whatever can constrain us to believe, unless like Marcion we assert the spirituality of Christ's body, and that His material body was a mere delusion. Besides, our Lord at the time of the institution was actually sitting at the table with His disciples ; and we cannot suppose that He then converted the bread and wine into His own body and blood, and that the disciples ate and drank Himself.* Such an assertion is too monstrous and too extravagant to be credited.

The doctrine of the Lutherans does not go the same length as that of the Romanists. They do not conceive that the bread and wine are actually converted into the body and blood of Christ, but that these elements remain substantially the same, and that in a mysterious manner there is along with them the body of Christ. Nor do they conceive that in the Lord's Supper there is any sacrifice offered to God, but that this ordinance is the feast of a sacrifice. Still, however, this notion is involved in the difficulties of the Roman Catholic view ; inasmuch as it ascribes ubiquity to the material body of Christ, and thus contains a statement contrary to reason. Jesus Christ as God is omnipresent ; but His material body must necessarily be limited ; matter necessarily involves the ideas of form and shape, and form and shape suppose limitation. Here, again, we quote Calvin, whose words, we consider, are unanswerable : "The presence of Christ in the Supper we must hold to be such as neither affixes Him to the element of bread, nor encloses Him in

* "The disciples," observes Mr. Beet, "could not possibly conceive Him to mean that the bread was actually His own body. Else He would have two bodies visible together in the same room, each being given for His disciples."

bread, nor circumscribes Him in any way; and it must moreover be such as neither divests Him of His just dimensions, nor dissevers Him by differences of places, nor assigns to Him a body of boundless dimensions, diffused through heaven and earth. . . . Let no property be assigned to His body inconsistent with His human nature. This is done when it is either said to be infinite, or made to occupy a variety of places at the same time."

The high Anglican view is represented in the Symposium by Dr. Littledale;* but we must confess that we have had great difficulty in following his statements. His views are enveloped in a mysticism and vagueness through which we cannot penetrate. He appears to assert that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice, but yet by no means identical with the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary, which was offered once for all; but in some respects a continuation of that sacrifice—the solemn oblation of the victim; all which is to us unintelligible. Neither do we precisely know whether according to this view the body and blood of Christ are really present in the ordinance, either by the conversion of the elements or in company with them. In one clause we would infer that Dr. Littledale is actually a believer in the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. "In the ancient liturgies," he observes, "all those ideas are embodied, and they teach that there is first an oblation of bread and wine; that this bread and wine become by consecration the body and blood of Christ, which are then pleaded before God as propitiatory for the whole world, and are lastly fed on by the faithful for their pardon, strengthening, and refreshing." We can see no difference between this and the Romish view of the sacrament as stated by Dr. Smith. The sacrifice which is here offered is called by Dr. Littledale the eucharistic

* Prebendary Sadler's views are similar, though somewhat more lucid.

sacrifice, "not in any way implying the addition of anything to Christ's one offering, but teaching us as nothing else can the perpetuity of the atonement." If by the eucharistic sacrifice is meant the grateful remembrance or representation of the sacrifice of Christ, then we accept the phrase as denoting our own views, and agree that this teaches us the perpetuity of the atonement, as nothing else can; but if something more is implied, as is apparently the opinion of Dr. Littledale, we are at a loss to apprehend what that something is, unless it be a repetition of Christ's one offering.

The Unitarian view of the ordinance, as stated by Mr. Hopps, is, that the Lord's Supper is a remembrance of Christ's blessed life and a communion with Him in His heavenly state. "Jesus loved, Jesus loves; this is our only creed in the sacrament." All this is very beautifully drawn out, and a view of the Lord's Supper is presented to us at once simple and calculated to work on our affections, to excite within us the liveliest feelings of admiration and gratitude. But it is the *death* of Christ, not His *life*, that we commemorate. Mr. Hopps indeed says: "As a rule it (the Lord's Supper) is too much connected with the sacrifice or death of Christ on Calvary, and with some theory of the way of salvation through His atoning blood." But this connection with His sacrifice or death does not arise from any human inference or interpretation; it is inseparably interwoven with the sacrament. It appears manifest on the surface that the Lord's Supper is designed to be a memorial of Christ's death, whatever more is contained in the ordinance; and the words of St. Paul are an obvious deduction from the language of the institution: "As often as ye do eat this bread ~~and~~ drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till He come."

We think we may obtain some clear understanding of

the nature and design of the Lord's Supper by regarding it in its reference to all times—the past, the present, and the future.

I. NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER AS SEEN IN ITS REFERENCE TO THE PAST. Now we do not think that in this reference there is any difficulty in understanding its design; it is a *memorial or commemoration of the death of Christ*. This is clearly inferred from the words of the institution, and is distinctly stated by St. Paul in the words just quoted: "As often as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show * the Lord's death." Here Christ Jesus is evidently set forth crucified before us; the circumstances of His death are acted over again—presented to our eyes by sensible and visible signs. The bread which we break is the emblem of His broken body; and the wine which we pour forth is the emblem of His shed blood. We are here reminded of the sufferings of Christ; we visit the garden of Gethsemane and there behold His bloody agony; we see Him mocked in the palace of Caiaphas, scourged and crowned with thorns by Pilate, and crucified on Calvary.

But the Lord's Supper is a commemoration not merely of the historical *fact* of Christ's death—of His agony and bloody sweat, of His cross and passion—but of the *design* of that death: "This is My body, which is *broken for you*. This is My blood of the New Testament, which is

* "To whom or before whom," asks Prebendary Sadler, "is the memorial made?" The question is fair and legitimate, though it is one which we think would hardly occur to the simple reader of Scripture. We show forth the Lord's death, that is, we announce it or commemorate it, not for the sake of God, but for the sake of ourselves, the Church and the world. This view does not cause it to cease being an act of worship; on the contrary, it is an act of the highest worship; we pour out our hearts in faith and gratitude to God for His unspeakable gift.

shed for you." If Christ had died for Himself, if His death, like that of all others, were the mere consequence of our mortal nature, we would not have been enjoined to commemorate it. The Jews were not commanded to commemorate the death of Moses their lawgiver, nor the translation of Elijah, the restorer of their law ; nor are we commanded to commemorate the death of Paul, the apostle of us Gentiles. But there is a singularity in the death of Christ, namely, that He died not for Himself, but for us ; that His death was a propitiation for our sins ; and it is precisely this singularity that is brought before us in the Lord's Supper. The atonement is the great truth here brought vividly to our recollection, presented to us by sacramental signs, held up to our wondering admiration. And let us also observe the *personal* view that is here given of the sacrament : "This is My body which is broken," not for the world, but "for you"—for you, as an individual. Every communicant is thus enabled to discern his personal interest in the Lord's death. The death of Christ is thus more strikingly displayed than it can be by the mere preaching of the word. In preaching, we address man's intellect ; we may explain the doctrine of the atonement ; we may impress its importance on the heart and the conscience ; we may exhort men to secure an interest in its benefits ; but in the Lord's Supper, not only are men's intellects addressed, but along with this their senses ; Christ crucified is brought vividly before them. There is and there can be no repetition of the sacrifice : "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many ;" but there is a commemoration and even a representation of that sacrifice.

It must not be supposed that, when we assert that the Lord's Supper is a commemorative ordinance, we give only a meagre view of its nature. The greatness of the fact, of which it is the commemoration, invests it with

unspeakable dignity. Were it merely the commemoration of the historical fact of Christ's death, still it would be an ordinance solemn and important; but being a commemoration of the atonement—of that amazing fact that the Son of God took upon Himself our nature, and suffered for our sins on the cross of Calvary, that "He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities"—the most amazing, and most beneficial occurrence in the universe—this certainly imparts a solemnity and an importance to the ordinance, the greatness of which words are altogether inadequate to express. And hence it is that this ordinance can only benefit those who believe; those who have not faith to discern the Lord's body cannot profit by it. And it is further evident that, according to the clearness of our view of the great atonement, and the strength of our faith in its reality, will, under God, be the benefit we will receive from it. So that with regard to the benefit which the Lord's Supper conveys to the believer, it may be said: "According to your faith be it unto you."

II. NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, AS SEEN IN ITS REFERENCE TO THE PRESENT. When we consider the Lord's Supper in reference to the past, we view it as a commemorative ordinance; but when we consider it in reference to the present, we regard it as perhaps *the most efficacious of all the means of grace*, designed to nourish religion in our souls, and to promote brotherly love toward our fellow-believers. But we do not consider that the mere act of partaking the Lord's Supper communicates, in some mysterious manner, grace to believers; that there is some mystic charm about it, or some unexplainable virtue that is absent from other Divine ordinances. Rather we would regard the Lord's Supper as a means of grace, precisely in the same manner as the word and prayer are, by acting upon our natural powers, enlightening our understanding, and sanctifying our hearts. Just

as God communicates His grace by the preaching of the gospel, rendering it effectual to the salvation of those who hear, so does He communicate His grace by means of the Lord's Supper, rendering it effectual to the salvation of those who partake. Only we consider that the Lord's Supper is peculiarly efficacious, because it presents the great doctrine of the atonement—that which is the foundation of our faith—more impressively before us than any other ordinance. And another great difference is that, as it presupposes faith in those who are to derive profit from it, it is an ordinance instituted, not so much for the conversion of sinners, as for the spiritual improvement of those who are already believers.

Hence we learn in what sense the Lord's Supper, besides being a commemoration of the atonement of Christ, is also a participation of Christ. "The cup of blessing," says the Apostle, "which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" By faith we commemorate the atonement of Christ; and it is evident that we can only do so aright, when we rely upon that atonement for our salvation, and derive from it our spiritual sustenance. And this idea is fully brought out by the ordinance. Christ, when He broke the bread, gave it to His disciples, saying, "Take, eat; this is my body;" and when He gave the cup, He said, "Drink ye all of it;" and in thus doing He offered Himself and all the benefits of His atoning death. He not only gave Himself *for* us, but He gave Himself *to* us. And, on the other hand, the disciples, by taking the bread and wine into their hands, declare that they accept this offer of Christ, that they receive Him as their Saviour, and place their implicit trust in His merits; and by actually eating the bread and drinking the wine, they profess that their spiritual life is sustained by union with Christ, that they obtain from

Him continual supplies of spiritual assistance, and draw out of His fulness even grace for grace. And if their faith is clear and strong, this grace will be communicated in the ordinance, and in this sense we believe that there is a participation of Christ; that, in the words of the Westminster Catechism—"The worthy receivers are not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith made partakers of His body and blood;" that is, as we interpret it, of Christ, "with all His benefits to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace."

Great stress has been laid by the Romanists on the sixth chapter of the Gospel of John, as teaching that, in the Lord's Supper, there is an actual eating of the body of Christ, and an actual drinking of His blood. We have, it is said, the words of Christ Himself on this point, as clearly and as positively expressed as possible. Jesus speaks not of a figurative, but of a literal participation. He expressly says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him." Can, it is asked, the doctrine of transubstantiation be more clearly taught? But a previous question requires to be answered. Do these words refer to the Lord's Supper at all? We think that the probability is that they do not, as they were spoken before the Lord's Supper was instituted; just, in a similar manner, as we believe our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus concerning regeneration does not refer to baptism. The words appear to be a strong statement and assertion of the necessity of faith and living union with Christ. It is to be observed that the Lord asserts this eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood to be

inseparably connected with salvation ; so that whoso does not so partake of Christ has no life in him, and whoso does so partake will be raised up at the last day ;—a statement which is true of living union with Christ, but not of the participation of the Lord's Supper. No doubt the Jews understood our Lord of an actual participation of His flesh and blood, for they are represented as striving among themselves, saying, "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" but we do not think, as Dr. Smith affirms, that our Lord, although He understood that this was the meaning given to His expressions, did not offer any explanation or correction. On the contrary, the whole passage shows that He is insisting on faith—on a spiritual participation of Him ; and the conclusion of the discourse is an assertion that His words are not to be understood in a carnal and literal, but in a spiritual sense. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing ; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

The Lord's Supper is also pre-eminently the ordinance in which we solemnly *dedicate ourselves to Christ*. It is a solemn act of dedication. By partaking of the bread and the wine offered by the Lord, we solemnly declare that we accept Christ as our Saviour, and acknowledge ourselves to be His disciples ; that we renounce all dependence on ourselves, and trust entirely on His merits ; and that whatever others may do, as for us we are determined to serve the Lord. We testify our determination to spend and be spent in His service, to obey His laws, and to advance as much as we can His glory in the world. Thus there is a sacramental or covenant engagement ; an acceptance of Christ on our part. The language of our partaking is, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of Christ ; by which the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." "O Lord,

truly I am Thy servant : I am Thy servant, and the son of Thy handmaid ; Thou hast loosed my bonds."

Nor must we forget that the Lord's Supper is specially designed as a means of grace to promote *brotherly love* among those who profess to be the disciples of Christ. It has been justly called in all ages, and among all denominations of Christians, *the communion*. Here we hold communion with one another ; we sit down as brethren at the same table ; we eat the same bread ; we drink the same cup ; we commemorate the same Saviour who died for us. "We, being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." And again, "We have been all made to drink into one Spirit." And this communion of the saints arises from union to Christ ; it is because we are one with Him that we are one with one another. And in no ordinance is this blessed truth more clearly seen than in the Lord's Supper ; it is a family feast—a representation of the original institution, when Christ, as the Master, sat at the head, and His disciples around the table. Nor is this communion of believers restricted to those who sit along with us at the same table. It is not limited by any sectarian narrowness, but embraces all who profess to belong to Jesus, by whatever name they are called, and to whatever sect they belong ; nay, it extends even to saints departed. This ordinance of the Supper ought to recall to us the memory of our deceased friends, and keep alive the affection which we bore to them when in this world ; they are still members of the communion of the saints, more highly favoured than we, for they have been admitted into the inner chambers of the palace of the King.

III. NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, AS SEEN IN ITS REFERENCE TO THE FUTURE. This is a reference which has been generally overlooked, or at least only cursorily mentioned, by the writers in this Symposium. They

dwell almost entirely on the past significance and the present efficacy of the ordinance, but they omit its future reference, and yet this we consider is also prominently brought forward. Especially *we are reminded of the second coming of our Lord*. By partaking of bread and wine, we show the Lord's death *until He come*. The Lord's Supper is a memorial of an absent Lord ; but even by this we are reminded that the absence is only temporary—that He who has gone away will come again. We here, then, declare our belief in the second advent, and thus look forward to that day when the Lord shall again appear on this earth, but not as formerly in a state of obscurity and humiliation, but of glory and majesty. And this event, which we declare at the holy table, is the source of our liveliest hope and joy ; it is that which comforts us amid all the sorrows of life. "To them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation." The Lord's Supper, then, leads our thoughts upwards to Jesus as our risen Head—as our exalted Redeemer ; as a commemoration of His death until He comes, it points forward to that period when He shall again appear upon the earth as the Saviour and Rewarder of His people, collecting His elect scattered throughout the universe, and presenting them faultless before the presence of His Father with exceeding joy.

The Lord's Supper also *anticipates the eternal communion which believers will enjoy with Christ in heaven*. This, also, is prominently brought before us in this ordinance ; for after our Lord had given the bread and wine to His disciples, He adds these words : "Verily I say unto you, I will not henceforth drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of God." There is no reason why these words should be disconnected from the ordinance ; they are words of the institution. The Lord's Supper is itself

a foretaste of heaven, and an earnest and pledge of its enjoyments ; believers are withdrawn from the world, and sit down by themselves at the table of communion ; the Saviour Himself is spiritually present with them ; by faith they receive the blessings of His grace ; it is often their experience that heaven is brought down into their souls : and thus the Lord's Supper is the emblem of the marriage Supper of the Lamb. Our affections are thus raised from this world ; with the eye of faith we look within the veil ; we anticipate the future ; we come to the general assembly and Church of the firstborn which are written in heaven, and are admitted into the goodly fellowship of Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and of the spirits of just men made perfect. "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God."

P. J. GLOAG, D.D.

XII.

A CAREFUL comparison of the foregoing papers will afford much comfort to a catholic believer in Christ Jesus. There are many differences in detail, and not a little of what is polemical ; but there is manifest loyalty of all to the common Lord, and the universal agreement that to His power and presence all the virtue of the sacrament must be attributed. The recognition of this common loyalty must of necessity tend to bring the several writers nearer one to another ; and whatever the exigencies of ecclesiastical propriety may seem to require, there must needs be a desire, stronger than ever, to hold the central truth of the faith in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace.

Nevertheless the differences expressed in the foregoing papers are very great and very important ; inasmuch as they are associated with, or indicative of, other divergences. The marvel is, and the mercy also, that notwithstanding theological wanderings, the trusting, sincere heart finds by the Spirit's guidance its way to Him who is the only Life. Both of two extremes have been sufficiently and ably set forth. The one recognizes in the Lord's Supper nothing but a commemorative service, in which holy memories are recalled, and holy desires and hopes are quickened. The other propounds a theory of renewed actual sacrifice, which is " not only a source of merit, but also of satisfaction ; for as, in His passion, Christ the Lord merited and satisfied for us, so also those who offer this sacrifice, by which they communicate with us, merit

the fruit of His passion, and satisfy for sin." When Dr. Smith speaks of the mass as a "daily representation of the sacrifice of Calvary," he must mean a daily *re*-presentation; "not a mere commemoration of the sacrifice performed on the cross, but also truly a propitiatory sacrifice by which God is appeased and rendered propitious to us"—a sacrifice in which Christ is actually immolated and offered. At least this is the teaching of the Council of Trent. It is not set forth as a new sacrifice, but as a renewed offering of the old.

Between these extremes there may be found a statement of the facts and an explanation of the ordinance which will satisfy the requirements of Scripture teaching.

The kingdom of Christ, the family of God, has a two-fold relationship. The Christian faith has its spiritual realities and its material forms. The Church of Christ, as a spiritual organization, is dependent for all life, both in its initiation and in its perfection, upon the indwelling Spirit of God. This is true both for the one and for the many, for the member and for the body. In the Christian Church, as a visible organization, this dependence is symbolically recognized and expressed. The recognition is embodied in two services, both of which were definitely appointed by Christ Himself. Baptism is the service of initiation, and the Eucharist of confirmation and perfection. In their relation to covenant privileges, these are to the New Testament what circumcision and temple sacrifices were to the old. Believing this, I must accept the Christian Eucharist as occupying the sacrificial foreground in the service of our sanctuaries.

But the relation of sacrifice to Divine service is not now what it was under the Mosaic economy. I cannot argue the question in detail, but must give results. The Mosaic sacrifices were arranged in three main divisions—sin offerings, burnt offerings, and peace offerings. These

were symbolical of the worshipper's chief requirements—atonement, self-consecration, and fellowship. The second of the three presupposed or involved the first, and the third both the second and the first. Fellowship could be enjoyed only when atonement for sin had prepared the way of access, and when personal consecration had been fully accepted. But when the sacrifice had been slain and the blood poured out, when the whole victim had been presented to Jehovah and accepted by Him, then from the altar there was given back to the offerer a portion, which sufficed for the festivities of himself and his companions. This fellowship with God was secured to the worshipper by the death of the victim, and it was, in its inmost reality, a participation in the life-sustaining virtue of the sacrifice itself, as a gift from the Most High. And to this the Eucharistic service corresponds. The atonement has been made, the oblation perfected, the reconciliation completed, and the Spirit of fellowship bestowed. All have not availed themselves of these accomplished facts ; but these facts have been accomplished, and avail for all. There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. Both Dr. Littledale and Dr. Smith acknowledge that there is no new virtue in the supposed Eucharistic offering. The virtue is entirely and for ever that of Calvary alone. But it must be added that there is no room for any repeated oblation of that one sacrifice.

I must somewhat insist upon this truth, because there has been, as it seems to me, a great tendency, both in mediæval and in modern theology, to shift the doctrine of atonement from its true position. There are many, good men and true, who read one-sidedly the message of the gospel. They are so intent upon the message of mercy, that although they acknowledge the mercy, they lose sight of the provisions of justice. They are entranced amid the glories of the incarnation evangel, until

they deny that there is any place for the death-throes of Calvary. On the other hand are those who confound the unfolding of the history with the arrangement of the gospel economy. They find the teaching of the Prophet followed by the sacrificial work of the Priest, and the darkness of the midday hour shadows for them even the brightness of the Easter morning. What if neither are right? If the work of atonement has no place in the history of individual reconciliation, yet it preceded and made possible the incarnation, even though for three-and-thirty years it waited for formal accomplishment. They forget this, who deny the doctrine of reconciliation by sacrifice. But it is no less true that reconciliation was effectually completed by Jesus Christ. Within the gospel message as it comes to the sinner there is no room for any repeated atonement. No new presentation, no new acceptance of the sacrifice, is hinted at in Scripture. We make mention of the death by which we live, and we look for pardon, justification, and acceptance only through its merit. But there is no repeated acceptance, in behalf of each, of that sin-offering which once became effectually the peace offering for all. Hence in the gospel economy there is room for the One Priest only, save as all are priests. There is no offering remaining for us, save that of ourselves and our thanksgiving. The whole sacerdotal theory sinks upon the sand when once we recognize the truth that Christ proclaims a finished reconciliation of man to God. We must remember this as we return to the Eucharist.

But if this be so, if the blood-shedding, the death, the presentation, and the acceptance were "once for all," then what abides? The sacrificial feast. This is perpetuated through all the ages. It is not a new feast, constituted at various times and in various places by various persons. It is the one festival following upon

and connected with the world's one peace offering, continuous through all time as the festive union of all the Lord's disciples until He Himself once more shall come. Always it abides, and wherever the gospel message comes, there the feast is ever ready and ever accessible ; and in it the ordained food is distributed as if ever fresh from the sacrificial altar wherever penitent and returning children seek to have and to enjoy their restored privilege of child-like communion. So true it is that "we have an altar," though the Victim lives and reigns ; "an altar of which," because the sacrifice is a sin offering, "they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." This recognition amply renders more than all that Dr. Littledale can claim because of the words "do," "covenant," and "memorial."

What, then, is the food which is provided in this sacrificial feast? According to the analogy of former usages, both Jewish and Gentile, it should be the flesh of the sacrifice, the things themselves which have been offered, the body of Christ. And in full harmony with this universal usage are the words of the Saviour—"Take, eat ; this is My body which is given for you." Accordingly, Dr. Smith tells that the real flesh is there ; that the substance of the bread gives way to the substance of Christ's body, whilst the bread appears to be unchanged. We are also told that this is the necessary interpretation of the Saviour's utterance, and that it must be accepted in faith. Now if no other explanation were reasonably possible, and if the statement did not intrude within the range of sensible observation, the case would be very different. But it is confessed by all that here to all appearance the bread is bread still, and the wine is wine. The phenomena are all unchanged, and so are the inherent properties. Between substances which resemble one another in species we can distinguish only by means

of scientific tests. In this case, as between the bread and the flesh, all the science is against the theory; the physical results contradict the theology. Even the Council of Trent gives as one reason why the cup was withheld from the laity, that, in certain circumstances, the consecrated wine, the supposed "blood," might otherwise "turn acid." We cannot accept the theory. Faith may transcend reason and may outrun the senses, but it may not ignore the former or manifestly contradict the latter.

So in another sense Dr. Luthardt tells us that the food provided is in truth and reality the body of Christ. It is bread, yet not merely bread. It is His real body in the bread. This theory travels beyond the limits of sense. Matter is supposed to be present, but it is not perceptible. No tests can discover it. Granted that negative evidence cannot disprove a positive assertion, it is no less true that a positive assertion cannot prove itself. So far as reason can guide us, the true humanity of Christ implies a material body, though in its glorified state adapted to spiritual life. If it be in heaven, it cannot be in ten thousand places upon earth. It is true that the apparently reasonable may nevertheless be the false, but reason must be the guide unless a higher authority can be adduced.

Thus are we brought once more to the solemn words, "Take, eat; this is My body, which is given for you." Because we cannot, without grievous injustice to the Christian religion, accept any such violent interpretation of the Saviour's utterance as either Dr. Smith or Dr. Luthardt proposes, it is not, therefore, necessary to explain them utterly away. They have a real and a blessed significance. When Jesus said to His disciples, "I am the door," He did not merely say that He resembled, or signified, a door. He plainly declared that, with reference to salvation, He was and is to men what the door is to the sheepfold. And similarly here He seems to say, "This

bread is to you, and for all the purposes of this holy feast, all that My body could be if, instead of this bread and this fruit of the vine, you did actually eat of My flesh and drink My blood." And immediately He adds, "Do this in remembrance of Me." Prepare this feast, accomplish this service, partake of this joyous sacrificial meal, and do it often; but as often as ye do it let it be a memorial of Me. And this the Church has ever done, bringing forth the bread and the wine and ordering them upon the table of the Lord as memorials of His one sacrifice, by His authority declared to be instead of His real body and blood. What, then, is this before me? A piece of ordinary bread? Yes, verily; but no longer an ordinary piece of bread. I do not care to say, with Mr. Beet, that to the eye of faith the symbols disappear. I see it, feel it, taste it—and it is bread; but it is bread which, in accordance with the Lord's appointment and promise, and by His power, has become as His own body. It is not merely a pictorial sign, but an ordained substitution. For the purposes of this feast, "this is My body."

How full of meaning, then, are the words of blame and of warning which the Apostle wrote to the Church at Corinth. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?" "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye show forth the Lord's death till He come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread, or drink the cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord;" as guilty as if it had been the real flesh itself which had been spurned or slighted. "For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself if he discern not the body." Well may the words ring in all ears—"Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup."

The benefits which arise from the due observance of and participation in this service are real and assured. They may be measured by the truths which are symbolized therein. What food is for the nurture and nourishment of the bodily life, that Jesus is to all who receive and trust Him for the nurture and nourishment of the spiritual life. He is all in all. The appointment of the outward feast is on the part of the Divine Saviour a sign and a seal of His purpose and promise to bestow life and all its attendant blessings upon those who sincerely and believingly fulfil His command. The participation in the outward feast is on the part of the communicant a sign and a seal of his acceptance of the promised gift, and of his reliance upon the Saviour for the bestowment, through the merit of His death, of His life, and all thereto pertaining. And so the gracious bestowal accompanies the dutiful communion; and with the broken bread there comes the eternal life, ever offered and always accepted as inseparable from the "new covenant" which was once and eternally made sure to us by His blood.

So far as I have understood the previous papers, they all agree in recognizing the necessity for a worthy participation in order to the obtainance of blessing. From Dr. Smith, if from any one, we might have expected a contrary statement; but even he will not acknowledge communion where there is not a true spiritual life. The concession is, for the present, sufficient. It is enough that the outward act alone could not avail, even though the flesh itself, the body of our blessed Lord, were the food upon the table. It is in this most literal sense that we may read, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth little." The flesh without the Spirit could accomplish nothing. For a corresponding reason, whether He speaks of His "flesh" or of the "living bread," it is easy for Him to associate as He will all

spiritual gifts with the one or with the other. He has declared His good pleasure. Himself dwelling in the highest heaven, where His humanity is glorified and enthroned, He has ordained the bread and the cup, whenever they are set apart as a consecrated memorial of Him, to be the sufficient and effectual substitute for His own body and blood. And whosoever so eateth of this flesh and drinketh this blood hath eternal life.

Thus must this Eucharistic Feast be acknowledged as the most central service of all Christian life and fellowship. It is in itself a visible testimony to the truth of the gospel history. "In the night in which He was betrayed, He took bread;" and from that night until now the Church has in one unbroken line of witnesses handed on these tokens of His dying love. The feast continues in our midst to-day, the sign and seal of perfected atonement and reconciliation, of provided fellowship and life. Here the presiding Lord, Master in His own banqueting house, dispenses by the gift of Himself the fulness of His grace. To Him all worship turns. All prayer and all praise find their warrant and occasion here. Promise and preaching can tell of nothing beyond the truths and privileges which find expression in this service. Gathering around this table, partaking of this sacrifice—never repeated, ever present, always "as newly slain"—the saints of God rejoice at once in their union with Him and their union in Him. Then, "strengthened with the bread of life," they go forth with renewed faith and love to labour and to wait "till He come."

So have the generations come and gone, and so will they come and go. Christians of to-day have their place in the long line of witnesses. Hand in hand, and heart with heart, the succession was, and is, unbroken. And unbroken it will be until the Lord Himself shall complete

the circle, having accomplished the number of His elect. Then He who first ordained the service shall by His presence for ever fulfil the promise of His ordinance, and the children of every age, and clime, and creed shall eat and drink with the Son in the kingdom of the Father.

G. W. OLVER, B.A.

Battersea, S.W.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON'S

New and Recent Publications.

THE CLERICAL LIBRARY.

THIS series of volumes is specially intended for the clergy of all denominations, and is meant to furnish them with stimulus and suggestion in all the varied departments of their work. The best thoughts of the best religious writers of the day will be furnished in a condensed form, and at a moderate price.

The first volume will be entitled,—

*THREE HUNDRED OUTLINES OF SERMONS ON THE
NEW TESTAMENT.*

To be followed by

II.

*THREE HUNDRED OUTLINES OF SERMONS ON THE
OLD TESTAMENT.*

III.

*OUTLINE SERMONS TO CHILDREN, WITH NUMEROUS
ANECDOTES.*

The series will probably extend to twelve volumes, and the price
will be 6s. each volume.

Large Crown 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

THE GREAT SCHOOLMEN OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

**A Concise Account of their Lives, and the Services they have
Rendered to the Church and the World.**

By W. J. TOWNSEND.

Hodder & Stoughton,

In one volume, 8vo, cloth.

**COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL
ACCORDING TO MARK.**

BY THE REV. JAMES MORISON, D.D.,

Author of "Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew," etc.

This valuable Commentary has already obtained a distinguished position for its many and varied excellences, and is now undergoing thorough revision by the Author.

Crown 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

**CHRIST IN THE CHRISTIAN YEAR,
And in the Life of Man. Trinity to Advent.**

BY THE RIGHT REV. F. D. HUNTINGDON, D.D.,

Bishop of Central New York.

Also a few copies of the previous work, ADVENT TO TRINITY, uniform with the above. By the same Author. Price 7s. 6d.

In one volume, 8vo, with Map, price 12s.

THE ACTS AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

BY THE REV. F. A. MALLESON, M.A.,

Vicar of Broughton-in-Furness,

Author of "Jesus Christ, His Life and His Work," etc.

I. SAUL.—The Preparation for the Gospel.—Early Life of St. Paul.—Stephen.—Conversion of Saul.—Damascus and Arabia.—The Calling of the Gentiles.—The Syrian Antioch.

II. ST. PAUL'S FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY.—Cyprus.—Antioch in Pisidia.—Iconium and Lycaonia.—The First Church Council.—Old and New Companionships.

III. SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY.—The Apostle led into Europe.—Paul and Silas at Philippi.—Thessalonica.—Athens.—Corinth.—Close of the Second Missionary Journey.

IV. THE THIRD MISSIONARY JOURNEY.—Ephesus.—Macedonia and Troas.—The Farewell at Miletus.—Last Journey to Jerusalem.

V. JERUSALEM.—Tumult at Jerusalem.—Speech on the Castle Steps.—Jewish Dissensions at Jerusalem.—Paul and Felix.

VI. ROME.—The Appeal to Rome.—Voyage and Shipwreck.—Malta.—Rome.

27, Paternoster Row, London.

Hodder & Stoughton,

8vo, cloth, price 9s.

STUDIES IN THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

BY REV. PROF. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D.

"It scarcely need be said that these studies from Dr. Fairbairn's pen are full of spiritual penetration, profound philosophy of moral life, and literary beauty. Devout in feeling, and evangelical in theological view, they are yet characterized by great freedom and independence of thought. We do not know where to look, save perhaps in Pressensé's 'Jesus Christ,' for a like combination of reverent belief and broad independent thinking."—*British Quarterly Review*.

CHEAPER EDITION. *Crown 8vo, cloth, price 5s.*

**THE COMING PRINCE; or,
The Last Great Monarch of Christendom.**

By R. ANDERSON, LL.D., Barrister-at-Law,
Author of "The Gospel and its Ministry," etc.

**NEW VOLUME OF THE "MEN WORTH
REMEMBERING SERIES."**

Crown 8vo, cloth, price 2s. 6d.

WILLIAM CAREY.

By JAMES CULROSS, D.D.,
Author of "John, whom Jesus Loved," etc.

The Volumes already issued are

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. WILLIAM WILBERFORCE. | By John Stoughton, D.D. |
| 2. HENRY MARTYN. | By Canon Bell, D.D. |
| 3. PHILIP DODDRIDGE. | By C. Stanford, D.D. |
| 4. STEPHEN GRELLET. | By W. Guest, F.G.S. |
| 5. ROBERT HALL. | By E. Paxton Hood. |
| 6. THOMAS CHALMERS. | By Donald Fraser, D.D. |
-

27, Paternoster Row, London.

Hodder & Stoughton,

8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d. each Volume.

THE EXPOSITOR.

FIRST SERIES. COMPLETE IN TWELVE VOLUMES.

EDITED BY REV. SAMUEL COX.

This work contains many valuable Series of Biblical Studies and Expositions, by the following, and other contributors :—

Prof. Fairbairn. The Dean of Peterborough. Canon Farrar. Prof. Bruce. Prof. Godet. Rev. S. Cox. Dr. Thirlwall. R. Payne Smith. Rayner Winterbotham. Prof. Reynolds. Prof. Plumptre. Rev. W. Sanday. J. Agar Beet. Prof. Massie. Rev. J. Rawson Lumby. Prof. Davidson. Rev. Dr. Morison. Dr. D. Brown. Dr. Dykes. Dr. Matheson. Prof. Milligan. Prof. Findlay. Canon Westcott. Marcus Dods, etc., etc.

Crown 8vo, cloth, price 9s.

**THE CHRISTIAN'S PLEA AGAINST
MODERN UNBELIEF.**

A Handbook of Christian Evidence.

BY THE REV. R. A. REDFORD, M.A., LL.B.,

Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics, New College, London.

"This volume is one of great ability and completeness. It is the fruit of a lifetime of scholarly and, of late years, professional dealings with Christian truth. Professor Redford brings to bear upon the matters discussed, not only wide reading and accomplished critical scholarship, but an acute and patient intellect, as little likely to be deluded by sophisms as disturbed by passion. Among all works of its class that have come under our notice, there is none that for masterly cleverness, completeness, and compendiousness, we could place by the side of this."—*British Quarterly Review*.

Second Thousand. Crown 8vo, cloth, price 8s. 6d.

EXPOSITORY ESSAYS AND DISCOURSES.

BY THE REV. SAMUEL COX,

Editor of "The Expositor."

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, price 8s. 6d.

I. AN EXPOSITOR'S NOTE BOOK.

Brief Essays on Obscure and Misread Scriptures.

"A series of short essays, of which it is difficult to exaggerate either the value or the importance."—*Standard*.

Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, price 8s. 6d.

II. BIBLICAL EXPOSITIONS.

Brief Essays on Obscure or Misread Scriptures.

"The tone of these homilies is wonderfully vigorous, and their standard surprisingly high. Mr. Cox has the pen of a ready writer, and his flowing and facile rhetoric seems never to fail."—*Literary Churchman*.

27, Paternoster Row, London.

Hodder & Stoughton,

Second Thousand. Crown 8vo, cloth, price 3s. 6d.

THE HEAVENLY WORLD.

Views of the Future Life by Eminent Writers.

CONTENTS.

The Glorious Inheritance: *C. H. Spurgeon*.—Ten Views of Heaven: *Alexander Maclaren, D.D.*—The Intermediate State: *John Foster*.—The Beatific Vision: *Robert Hall, M.A.*—What is Heaven: *Addison, Cowper, etc.*—The Redeemed in the Glorified State: *Isaac Watts, D.D.*—Eternal Rest: *Richard Baxter*.—Heaven and its Associations: *William Jay*.—Nature of the Kingdom of God: *Thomas Chalmers, D.D.*—The Consummation of Happiness: *Matthew Henry*.—The Heavenly State: *Richard Price, D.D.*—The World to Come: *John Bunyan*.—Immortality: *Edward Irving, M.A.*—The Perfect World: *D. Thomas, B.A., J. A. James, R. M. McCheyne, etc.*

In Two Volumes. Crown 8vo, price 15s. With Maps.

HISTORY OF THE RISE OF THE HUGUENOTS.

BY HENRY M. BAIRD,

Professor in the University of New York.

“Professor Baird has produced a work which for carefulness of investigation and completeness and accuracy of statement, is far in advance of all predecessors. We thank Professor Baird for a book of great historical and moral value, of untiring patience, scrupulous fairness, noble sympathies, and the deepest religious interest.”—*British Quarterly Review*.

Second Thousand. Crown 8vo, cloth, price 6s.

THE RELIGIONS OF CHINA:

Confucianism and Taoism described and compared with Christianity.

BY JAMES LEGGE, LL.D.,

Professor of the Chinese Language and Literature in the University of Oxford.

“By a long residence in China, the faculty of acute observation, and a protracted study of the sacred and canonical books of the nation, the translation of which he has for many years past been giving to the public in a voluminous series, Professor Legge is perhaps better entitled than any other man to claim the right of speaking on the subject. Criticism is almost put out of court, and it becomes us rather to listen respectfully to the utterances of the master.”—*Trübner's Oriental Record*.

27, Paternoster Row, London.

Hodder & Stoughton,

CHEAP EDITIONS OF HOOD'S ANECDOTES.

I.

Fourth Thousand. Crown 8vo, price 6s. pp. 700.

THE WORLD OF ANECDOTE.

An Accumulation of Facts, Incidents and Illustrations, Historical and Biographical, from Books and Times, Recent and Remote.

By E. PAXTON HOOD.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS :—Ways and Means of Doing Good.—Romantic Transformations of Human Life.—Great Events from Trifles.—Dogs, and the Animal World.—Crime and Cruelty.—Silence and some of its Votaries.—Illustrations of Adventure.—Ghosts, Dreams, and the Supernatural.—Anecdotes of Life and Character.—Humour and the Humorous Side of Life.—Things Clerical and Pulpit Celebrities.—Cooks and Cookery.—Varieties of Womanhood.—Instances of Human Folly.—Lawyers and some of their Words and Ways.—Death and Dying.

II.

Fifth Thousand. Crown 8vo, price 6s. pp. 776.

THE WORLD OF MORAL AND RELIGIOUS ANECDOTE.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS :—The Noble Army of Martyrs.—The Bible.—Prayer.—Varieties of Usefulness.—Heroes of the Church.—Christian Eccentricities.—Illustrations of Ignorance, Superstition and Folly.—Aspects of Heathenism.—Incidents in Missionary Work.—Conversions.—Providence : The Finger of God.—Christian Life and Character.—Singular Personal Characteristics.—Illustrations of Bible Texts and Truths.—Preachers and Preaching.—Self-Deception.—Types of Noble Women.—Illustrations of Popish Folly.—Kings : Some of their Words and Ways.—The Heroic and Noble in Conduct and Character.—Temperance and Intemperance.—Kindness and Meekness.—Fragments of Conversation, Wit, Wisdom, etc.—Presence of Mind.—Happy Illustrations and Suggestive Parables.—Wonders of God in Creation.—Glimpses of The Supernatural.—Death-bed Lights.

27, Paternoster Row, London.

